

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
COMP PLAN DELIBERATIONS  
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2003**

City Hall Council Chambers  
210 East 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The public hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman, Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the City Hall Council Chambers, 210 East 13<sup>th</sup> Street, Vancouver, Washington.

**ROLL CALL**

Planning Commission Present: Dick Deleissegues, Lonnie Moss, Ron Barca, Carey Smith, Jeff Wriston, Vice Chair; Jada Rupley, and Vaughn Lein, Chair.

Planning Commission Absent: None.

Staff Present: Rich Lowry, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Patrick Lee, Long Range Manager; Bob Higibe, Assistant Long Range Manager; Evan Dust, Program Manager II, Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

**GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Approval of Agenda for October 30, 2003**

The agenda for October 30, 2003, was approved as distributed.

**B. Communications from the Public**

LEIN: Okay. Then I'll open it for communications from the public. Anyone wishing to come forward before the Planning Commission on items other than what is on tonight's public hearing agenda, now would be that time. We'd ask that you step to the microphone and state your name and address for the record, please. If not -- are you here on a specific case?

AUDIENCE: A particular property.

LEIN: Okay. We'll get to you in a few minutes; okay?

AUDIENCE: Oh, I'm sorry.

LEIN: Thank you. Yes.

KEPCHA: Could I speak to you for just one second?

LEIN: Sure, if it's on something other than what's on the agenda.

KEPCHA: Yeah. Yeah.

LEIN: Sure. Great.

KEPCHA: I live out east of Washougal.

LEIN: Could you state your name and address for the record.

KEPCHA: My name is Michael, the last name is Kepcha, K-e-p-c-h-a. I live on 39215 NE 28th Street and that's 98671 is the zip. The reason I'm here is I've been screaming about the fire hazard danger and I think they should ought to do some kind of binding thing on the zoning on that because where I live they're putting at almost 30,000 people down there on Borin Road in the summertime and I'm uphill from there and if they have any kind of fire out there, I've been scared to death for the last about 15 years since they had the fire over there by Jones Creek that started running and if they ever have one up there, it's not going to get stopped, it's going to take everybody's houses that's up above out. That's the only thing I wanted to say. I would appreciate it if you guys could do something about that possibly or put that into consideration with the zoning next time around.

LEIN: Okay. I know that there is a designation on all of the GIS systems that show where the dangerous areas for fire are, those have been identified within the county. I think, if I'm not mistaken, the fire marshal has tried to provide educational materials as well as advice to people in those areas to be able to do the correct types of landscaping, the distance the landscaping should be kept from homes, et cetera, but there are two or three areas within the county that are very dangerous and have that potential for if a fire gets going, it's going to be much like what happens in, has been happening in California.

KEPCHA: Well, the main reason I'm raising cane, you got that many people, you've got about almost 30,000 people down there on that little teeny two-lane road, one-lane road in and out down below my house, when they go in there and they're in there for about 23 times a year and a lot of times it's maybe only 10 or 15,000, but still it's lots and lots of people, there's no way in the world they could evacuate them out of there. I have let my landscaping go a little bit, but I used to have it all cleared back. I've got a bunch of trees around that I planted as landscape shrubs and they got away from me, but still we've lost three mobile homes up there, one before I got there and two since I've been there and there's nothing they could do, they just had to sit there and let them burn to the ground when they started. And we got lucky on both of those, or the three of them, they were back in the woods and they didn't go further just only because of the fire people they have out

there were able to hold it. They didn't even have water so they had to keep bringing truck after truck with water to fight them. So that's all.

## **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:**

### **UPDATE OF CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, continued**

**PLEASE NOTE: This hearing will focus on wrapping up any remaining testimony from previous hearings. The Planning Commission will then close the public hearing and begin deliberations.**

Clark County is updating its Comprehensive Plan. As part of this effort, the Clark County Planning Commission will be holding a hearing to take testimony on, and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding update to the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. At this hearing, the following will be considered:

Proposed changes to the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan text and policies contained within.

Proposed Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Maps for unincorporated rural and resource lands, and maps establishing expanded Urban Growth Area boundaries and providing plan designations for unincorporated lands within such boundaries for each of the following cities in Clark County: Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal, and Yacolt.

Implementation Measures - Proposed zoning ordinances and other measures necessary to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

Capital Facilities Plans and supporting documents.

A Final EIS issued on the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for Clark County and cities within the county.

**Staff Contacts: Patrick Lee, (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4112 or Bob Higbie, 397-2375, Ext. 4113.**

LEIN: Well, thank you. We'll continue on, then, with the update of the Clark County comprehensive plan. I'm assuming, Mr. Lee, there's no staff report at this point?

LEE: No. We will -- I think we will, should take testimony from those that have signed up and then after testimony we will be able to give some brief staff presentations on comprehensive plan and code changes should we get into deliberations.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. I'll start with the sign-up list. Nothing in particular, we are asking that people testifying limit their testimony to five minutes. I see some names here that are people who have had the opportunity to testify previously. I'm assuming that their testimony will be different this time so it's not repetitive. So Rick Lycksell.

LYCKSELL: We have property at 14807 NE 182nd Avenue.

LEIN: Could you state your name and address for the record, please.

LYCKSELL: Rick Lycksell and the address is 14807 NE 182nd Avenue.

LEIN: Thank you.

LYCKSELL: The property is 18 acres and what we're asking is that it be brought into the comprehensive plan and to be rezoned as two and a half acre lots. Half of the property is zoned as two and a half and half of the property is zoned as five acre. The zoning line goes right through the middle of the property. All the lots around us, it makes sense to make it all two and a half acre lots because of all the lots that are around us. And that's -- I mean that's basically why I'm here. We've gone down and talked to different people in the County, they don't understand why the zoning went right through the middle of our property and why half of it's five acre and half of it's two and a half acre, but that's why we're here and we're hoping that we can join into the plan that they already have going out there. That's it.

LEIN: Okay. Any questions from members of the Commission?

MOSS: What was that address again, Rick?

LYCKSELL: 14807.

MOSS: 14807.

LEE: Actually just the northern portion of the property is in the Hockinson Rural Center and then there is Mud Creek in the floodplain which is where the rural center boundary in general was drawn, so north of that you have the 2.5 acre rural center residential zoning and then south of the creek you have 5-acre rural residential zoning.

LYCKSELL: And let me correct that I'm sorry the address is actually 15407 NE 182nd Avenue and the creek runs right through the middle of our property.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you very much. Vern Veysey.

VEYSEY: My name is Vern Veysey. I live at 4816 NE 259th Street and I have a presentation on two pieces of property, people that I've been working with requesting a change in their comprehensive plan designation. The first one there's copies there for everybody. Do you have an overhead? There's two right here to go on the overhead.

The first piece of property belongs to Bob and Janice Pettit, they live at 21710 NW 31st Street. That's Parcel Number 179902 and it consists of approximately 32 acres. I'll wait until he gets the overhead up there. Presently the comprehensive plan designation is agriculture and it's zoned Ag-20 and the property is presently used for residential and some grazing of some cattle. If you look at the way the property is divided in the area, to the south it's zoned 5 acres. And I don't have a -- do you have a pointer? Oh, great. To the

south of this was a 25-acre piece that was done in a cluster fashion so there's the one-acre lots with the remainder. This is Flume Creek that runs through their property so most of the property at least to the west cannot be developed because of that creek, so this is the property we're looking at. To the south as I said before is already zoned 5 acres. There's 5 acres on the west side, there's 5 acres on the north side and on the east side, so it's basically surrounded by smaller lots. This is a 10, this is a 10, but these are 5s and this is the only 20 that borders the property. So it's basically been surrounded. I can't figure out why this one piece was left in the middle but it was.

The property is basically not farmable. If you see this stream that comes down through the middle of it, there's a pond, the steepness of the slopes does not lend itself to cultivation, there is some pasture that goes on, the residence on the property is right here. There has been a road developed that comes in to serve this property so it is now served by a 20-foot wide improved road and the power and services can come in that direction. So what we're asking is that this property be redesignated as 5-acre zoning. And probably the best way for it to be developed would be the same way as this adjacent property was where there would be one-acre lots on the upper side and the remainder of it put into some kind of a conservation covenant to protect this streamway. I think it would be a shame if it were divided in a way that the creek was actually disturbed, so I think the cluster provision, type of provision, is a good one that the County has. And the owner I think feels that because there's been 5 acres here and 5 acres there and 5 acres there and 5 acres there, that why were they left out and not designated as such. So that's the request. Any questions? Pretty simple.

The next one is a little more complicated. This is the one that we were, just leave that up there for a second, I think this shows the Ag-20 zoning, it shows where the 5-acre zoning is, and you can see for some reason that line went kind of cockeyed there. So this is 20-acre zoning and this is 5-acre zoning and why the line didn't continue to go or why they didn't go up and pick up all that property that has basically already been divided I don't know. The one thing that I believe we need to consider is that what is is and no matter how hard you try to take 5-acre lots make it 20-acre zoning it's just not going to be there, especially when there's houses on it.

DUST: Vern, which one do you want first, the aerial or the zoning?

VEYSEY: Yeah, put the aerial on first. This next property belongs to a lady by the name of Velda Dicky. It's a 40-acre piece of property. It's zoned office campus and it's right next to WSU, WSU is right here. This piece of property has a large arena on it, two houses. It was built for a stable and has not been able to operate that way because it did not get a conditional use permit and the County shut it down. This lady got it back because the contract went void and so now she's stuck with all this structure to try to figure out what to do, and with the office campus overlay it's difficult for this to move ahead in a development mode.

It's also got some unique problems in that this stream that runs completely through the property does divide it into two sections, there's a section over here that is buildable and

about 16 acres out of the 40 acres over here that's really buildable. The Bonneville power lines go right through here and it kind of divides that from the residential which is Mount Vista over here. So the idea here would be to, and this is already in the urban growth boundary, so the idea here would be to either make this a zone that would allow for a residential. Can you put the other picture up there for me, please. Again, here's Mount Vista, Bonneville power lines. The idea would be to take that piece of property that's buildable and tie it in with residential. We have the separation of the creek area that can't be built on and then that would allow for this end of it to be developed with the office structures.

What I think would be a better idea here is to go ahead and move this into a mixed use program where you could actually use the open space to facilitate like condominiums or some other kind of development here that would allow access to that area as well as with the office on this side that would allow it to use the open space area to enhance and to facilitate that usage. The way it is now there isn't much a person can do unless they get the entire area to be developed as some kind of office complex. And you have a lot of people that are involved here and at your last hearing or the hearing before I think actually you had testimony from the citizens indicating that they wanted that changed back or that zone removed.

The owner of this property does not want that to happen, but they would like it changed so that they could in fact use the property and a mixed use on the entire 40 or at least designating a portion of it to go residential and a portion of it to office would help facilitate that. As it stands right now there isn't anything that she can do with it other than continue to rent the two houses. You can't board horses there even though it's a large facility and if you did start that business, it would be in conflict with the present zoning and the present comp plan designation. So the request here is to change this from the office campus with the idea that it's going to have some direct affiliation with Washington State University to a mixed use that allows for a combination of residential as well as office complex in that area. Any questions?

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Veysey?

SMITH: Have these been assigned numbers by the County?

VEYSEY: Pardon?

SMITH: All of these site-specific requests have had numbers, I just wonder if they've been assigned?

LEE: I think the first one was SSR2003-030 I believe; is that correct?

TOWNE: Yes, that's right.

LEE: And this is the first time we've heard of this particular proposal.

BARCA: And clarification, the last property that you went through it's designated right now Urban Reserve 10; is that correct?

VEYSEY: No. It's actually in the urban growth boundary and it's campus office designation.

BARCA: That's the proposed designation. No?

LEE: No, that is the existing office campus designation. I think, what do we have, about 200 acres around Washington State University that's designated for office campus. The thought when it was designated in '94 that it might be a good research and development type site that would be complimentary to the University.

BARCA: Okay. So that is the current designation?

LEE: Yes.

VEYSEY: And the restrictions are such that it's probably not going to happen unless you can get everybody together to do something and that's probably not going to happen, so how do you start taking property that's within the urban growth boundary and start to allow it to develop and that's why we're here with this request.

LEIN: Any other questions of Mr. Veysey?

MOSS: Yeah. Well, I had one more for staff maybe. This apparently is not considered an agricultural use, the use that, this horse stables and riding arena because --

LEE: In terms of the zoning it's urban zoning office campus.

VEYSEY: And even if it were agri --

MOSS: But isn't agricultural permitted in all zones?

LEE: Yes, it is.

MOSS: Why then --

VEYSEY: But to do the stables you have to have a conditional use permit and to do that it would take about \$100,000 worth of improvements. And then when you were through with that, you'd still be in an urban area with a rural facility.

MOSS: Why does this particular agricultural use require a conditional use permit when others don't?

LEE: It depends on, I guess, whether or not it would be determined that the principal use is commercial in nature as opposed to agriculture.

MOSS: But isn't agriculture supposed to be commercial in nature? I mean we have long-term commercial significance for agriculture. It seems like the owner here is kind of put into a box and I'm wondering why.

LEE: I don't, I don't know the history of the stables. I don't know, this is the first time we've heard of this proposal so I can't, I can't really give you a direct answer to the question other than sort of the general intent.

WRISTON: You have reinforcements come in. Oh, maybe not.

LEIN: Thank you. Zeiler.

BACKMAN: Good evening. Barbara Backman, attorney for Fred and Ethel Zeiler. Their address is 10518 NE 124th Avenue, we are number 236 on your list. Mr. and Mrs. Zeiler wish they could have been here tonight, but seeing as how Fred is 86 and Ethel is 93 they thought it might be a little late for them so they asked me to come in their place.

The Zeilers have been residing in Clark County on a 15-acre farm since 1940 and five years ago as they were getting older they wanted to do something nice for Clark County and they gave 5 of those acres and had them designated as park. Now they realize they need to go into assisted living and they want to sell the property. Under the comp plan it is designated as a mixed use property but it's zoned light industrial although it's smack dab in the middle of a neighborhood. So we tried to sell the property initially to an excavating company, they were going to store all their heavy machinery there, that deal fell through but it leaves now the Zeilers wondering what's going to happen to this beautiful farm and they're going to have an excavating crew or some heavy industrial business smack dab in the middle of their beautiful neighborhood that they just made a park next door. So the reason I'm here tonight and Mr. John Morris of Coldwell Banker is to see if we can't do something to help the Zeilers in this neighborhood.

MORRIS: Thank you. I'm John Morris with Coldwell Banker. I apologize for my attire tonight, I literally just jumped off an airplane after being gone for a week and I barely made it to the meeting so I hope you'll excuse my appearance. Is there a pointer up here? Oh.

DUST: Yellow button.

MORRIS: Yellow button. Thank you. The property that we're -- that's in question happens to be this parcel right here. You'll see that in the current comp plan it is currently included. The location, this is the 503 going north at 99th Street which is just about down, down below right there, that's 99th Street. You can see in the old comp plan this section up here was the northern boundary of the comp, of the growth region, and this property was zoned light industrial, which is very probably appropriate at the time, but you can see in the proposed comp plan you've got residential surrounding it. The parcel immediately to the south of it is the 5 acres that was given for park land. That's now Dogwood Park. The property immediately on the backside is the Saddle Club so that will give you an idea



exactly where this piece lies. It's the only parcel in the light industrial designation that fronts on 124th Avenue which is going to be a street servicing residential properties.

Kind of another interesting thing about this particular parcel -- well, let's go to the next, the next overhead. We can probably race through that one because I'm sure you can see that it's included in light manufacturing zone, there's the park down below it, you can see I think a little bit better 124th Avenue there. You've got residential to the south of it, you've got a couple of neighborhoods that have been built down through here. One thing that I think that and the proposal to change this to a residential designation makes an awful lot of sense because it's again going to be surrounded by residential properties on all sides, it's got a park there. One thing that this will do, there's already been a utility review done on this property and the sewer line has to come from over here at this intersection. There's not too many ways to get that sewer over there, they won't let us expand from this direction, so in order to get that sewer line across, there's two properties that need to have an easement in order to bring that sewer over. And it's quite spendy crossing 503, that piece would help facilitate because the Zeilers wish to get out of that property.

As a light manufacturing piece it doesn't make sense, it's not going to work, there are no takers for that at a price that makes sense. We do have people that would be interested in that property as a residential piece and the Zeilers would be willing to subsidize the sewer expansion across there which will also help facilitate that urban growth that you're proposing for the remaining parcels in there. Could we go to the next overhead, please. You can see already it's included in the MU, multi-use, district, we're not asking a piece to be included, just the zoning be reconsidered in light of the fact of all of the changes that are occurring in their immediate vicinity. I've included a couple other overheads, I don't know that they're necessarily important. You can go down to the parks and trails. One, it shows, it shows the park immediately adjacent, but I think that's basically the information that I have for you.

BACKMAN: John, I would just like to add that there is no access to that property other than through 124th, you can't reach it from 503. And also there are a number of small children living in the neighborhood and so with traffic in and out of light industry it might be a very dangerous situation, it's a small narrow road.

MORRIS: And I do have copies. If you wish copies of these overheads, I do have copies on the way, but, again, the other gentleman who was joining me here tonight was stuck at a meeting and he'll be here with those. So I have those to hand to you if you'd like to have them. Any questions?

LEIN: Any questions from members of the Commission?

BARCA: Just for clarification purposes, then the request is to change it to residential?

MORRIS: An R1-6 designation or something consistent with what you have planned in the surrounding area.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

MORRIS: Thank you.

LEIN: JB Bishop.

BISHOP: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, my name is JB Bishop. I reside at 12609 SE 15th in Vancouver in Cascade Park. I'm here on behalf of my handicapped business partner who owns a piece of property residential use and zoned. And I sent a letter in on October 14th that was read into the record or entered into the record at your October 16th meeting. I'm in addition to representing him per that letter, his name is Robert Jones, I'm also representing Mrs. Nancy Dubar and her father Robert Waterman who own the adjacent property directly to the east and that was referenced in my letter in regards to the Evergreen Highway Columbia River frontage property.

The specific issue that is involved, and there are other people here to testify also this evening who are adjacent property owners directly to the west, the Brooking family and they will speak on their own behalf I'm sure, the issue is fairly minor in nature at this stage I believe, but it's important to be vigilant in participating within your process. Explicitly the issue that the letter addressed on October 14th on behalf of the two property owners that I represent as a friend and as a care-giver for, one of them is permanently handicapped, Mr. Jones, the other one on the neighboring property owner his daughter takes care of Mr. Waterman who's ill with Alzheimer's disease and lives on the property, I'm here as a representative as I said for both of them.

The issue at hand is that the County planning staff is choosing to properly recognize an error was made in the new comprehensive plan designations and they have so advised the Planning Commission at this stage that there is an error and that they intend to correct it in discussions with you and pass that recommendation on after your deliberations to the County Commissioners. The error was in designating this property at this time in the proposed comprehensive plan as business park in an area that has been zoned since 1996 as a residential urban holding area just outside the urban growth boundary and the issue that we're discussing has come up a second time. In 1994, to be very brief, when you initially enacted the comprehensive plan this property with a broad brush in error as oversight somehow between staff, Planning Commission and County Commission ended up being business heavy industrial and this property, both Mr. Jones', Mr. Waterman's, the Brookings' property and Paul King's to the far west, a total of seven parcels as an oversight in 1994, ended up being heavy industrial tied in with the Columbia Vista Mill which obviously is a current heavy industrial use and is proposed in 1994 to continue as heavy industrial. Our property was colored to the west inaccurately to also be called heavy industrial.

In 1996, two years later, when the property owners who were not informed of the process, and we certainly understand you don't site-specific notify property owners when you're putting together a comprehensive plan, they discovered that this had occurred in 1994, we pointed it out to the planning staff, the planning staff worked with the Planning Commission

in December of 1996, you unanimously changed it to urban holding UR-10 and so that's where we thought the battle was resolved and that it wouldn't be an issue. And that was done in December of 1996 and my letter references that and I provided copies as exhibits to my letter of October 14th of the action of this Planning Commission which unanimously approved it to be designated as residential property and that was also unanimously approved in December by the County Commissioners. We find, though, this summer that somehow a error was made, we believe it was an oversight the first time, but this time we believe an error was made. We pointed it out to the staff and working with the staff over the last two and a half months they've acknowledged that they accept that there is an error. An error can be corrected early on and that they will be recommending to you that this property along with the Brookings' property, Paul King's property and some other properties that were noted wrong that they should not be called business park but that they should be called urban holding 10.

The brief final comments I have on behalf of the two property owners that I'm speaking for, Robert Jones and the Watermans, is that we do find that the designation by the planning staff of calling the property to the east which is the Columbia Vista Mill, and the property to the north which is across the new 192nd interchange which we, most of us, know as the quarry, for long-range planning we greatly support the planning staff's determination to call for long-range development, long-range zoning, and most importantly for future job creation that the property that is now zoned and grandfathered use will continue as Columbia Vista Mill owned by Peter Kiewit & Company that we support the planning staff in calling that in the future with your deliberation and the County Commissioners business park. We feel that that will create more jobs, more opportunity for a good neighbor development to our residential properties, and so we would support a long-range plan designation for the adjacent property. And we are directly adjacent property owners to the west of that property that for the long-term through your process that that is in support with the staff as property owners that that be designated as they have studied and analyzed as business park.

You do have a letter that I saw today in this packet that's in front of you from Peter Kiewit who are acknowledged property owners directly to the east, they're adhering that they feel that they don't support the staff, they feel that they should stay as heavy industrial. The only comment that I will make in that regard is that for 28 years I've been a commercial real estate investor/developer, I've built in Oregon, Washington and California office and retail, I'm not an expert, I'm just an individual, I am an involved individual as an investor and I believe in comprehensive planning, I absolutely adhere to working with planners and with the County commissions and the City staffs when I develop my property and I believe for the long-term that that is a highly desirable business park location that will not be disturbed by a change that you would look at for the next 20 years as a projection of zoning from the standpoint of the current property owner because they have a grandfathered use, they are a mill there, and as long as that mill is economically viable it will produce jobs and provide a use for that property, but when and if economics will change, the highest and best use in my opinion is as the staff deems that with the frontage on the river, the opportunities for the new 192nd interchange, and the investments that the State and the County and the City are making in that area, that the best use would be business park.

The last comment I have in regards to the residential zoning that we want to have corrected and ask for your support on is that we would request that the zoning designation even though it would be urban holding, we understand that because it's slightly right outside the boundary and on the boundary line, Paul King's property is to the west of the existing urban growth boundary, it's in Vancouver (inaudible) of influence, recently on a land trade between Camas and Vancouver which involved going to the east of the Vancouver line to the new interchange at 192nd, what we would request is that the actual zoning designation on the map in the long-term be UR, excuse me, UR-10, which is similar to the adjacent properties to the west. All the properties to the west along the river there are UR1-10. That's the focus of my comments and I appreciate it very much. The other property owners who are directly adjacent to us, the Brookings, came shortly after I did, they're here, I would hope that you might take them in sequence with mine instead of making them wait. But I don't know your procedure, I'd respectfully make that request.

LEIN: Well, we do have a sign-up list. Are there any questions of Mr. Bishop? Okay, thank you.

MOSS: I'm confused about exactly what is being requested here. You've mentioned both urban holding and UR, which I take to be urban reserve.

BISHOP: The request specifically, Commissioner, is that the -- if the property, all of the property, the four property owners are outside the urban growth boundary and so we support the staff's direction to make that urban reserve. It would be urban reserve 10 but within that designation, when and if a zoning designation is put on it when it would be brought into the urban growth boundary, we would ask for the consistent zoning of the properties along the river adjacent to the west which is, let me get the exact wording here because I have it written down, it's R1-10, which is the adjacent properties.

And I would like one last clarification if I could. There's a letter from the County planning, the City planning staff that's part of the packet tonight, it's your second letter, it's Number 244. I meant to make a comment on it. The City Long-Range Planning Director, Ms. Hudson, Mr. Bob Lee's counterpart, is specifically also supporting our request, the property owners request, and her Riverfront Maps Land 1, Page 1 note she is fully supporting it, but she indicating that on behalf of the City that the City is supporting what I believe is the short-term interest of Peter Kiewit and recommending that the property next to us, the Columbia Vista Mill, continue in the long-range plan to be called heavy industrial. We as property owners object to that and we disagree with it, but we certainly agree with her support of our request to bring our property back into line to be residential as it was always intended to be. Thank you.

LEIN: Susan Gilbert.

GILBERT: My name is Susan Gilbert. I reside at 2600 NW 329th Street in Ridgefield and I'm chairman of the Enterprise Paradise Point Neighborhood Association. This testimony is in reference to the October 2nd, 2003 letter to the Commission from Stephen Horenstein of

Miller/Nash who represents four landowners in the La Center area who wish to have the County consider their collective properties as part of the rural industrial land bank as outlined in RCW 36.70.367. Although we agree that this land is most definitely suited for industrial or office park or retail development, it might behoove the Planning Commission to question whether these 115 acres be allowed to develop well outside the urban growth boundary within the strict rules outlined by this RCW. And for clarification purposes the RCW indicates that industrial land bank is just that, industrial land and not for office park, retail or commercial development.

It is true that we are in desperate need of more industrial land; however, to restrict the use of these 115 acres to only industrial, which means basically manufacturing or distribution, may not be a wise choice. We must remember that manufacturing is leaving the country at an alarming clip. Sony just announced over 20,000 layoffs. Many of us were shocked, well, more than shocked to learn the Dollar Tree Stores Distribution facility in Ridgefield, some one million square feet, supports only 100 jobs. Ridgefield Junction has several strictly manufacturing facilities and People's Community Credit Union set up an office eight years ago to hopefully service this new clientele. Now in this past eight years the Ridgefield Junction has grown by leaps and bounds on the industrial area. People's Community Credit Union is closing their office on November 30th because they do not have enough business. Now this is a warning signal and it's a real warning signal. If these employees are not supporting our community by not banking here are they contributing to it in any other way.

It is also true that much of manufacturing and distribution do not support family wage jobs. We are at a crucial point in our growth here in Clark County. We must start attracting more than just manufacturing and distribution. If we limit ourselves to just that, we will have nothing to fall back on when the going gets even tougher in the manufacturing sector. We must diversify by trying to attract office campuses and retail which will give our County coffers a much needed boost and we have little land left to do just that. Although this legislation was a good idea at the time, at least some thought it was a good idea at the time, I'm not sure I did, it may at this point restrict our county in a market driven economy. It would seem to me that today's climate the more flexible you are, the more successful your community will be. You have to be able to have available land for what the demand is. How unhappy we would be to find that a large company headquarters would like to locate here but cannot because one of the last large tracts of land for development is unavailable because it was locked up in a master plan industrial park category.

Now one of the tenants of the RCW also said that this industrial land should be looked at only if it is adjacent to or close to the urban growth boundary. This 115 acres is about as far away from the urban growth boundary as you can get without falling into the river. The County Commissioners have asked that this land be considered in the overall inventory allocation for industrial land; however, one of the priorities of the legislation is that the land be adjacent to or in close proximity to an urban growth area. Another point to consider is that part of this land, a former landfill, has been designated highest level risk by the DOE. Work on it has been completed and maintenance it continues. It has been reported by the DOE that confirmed metals and phenolic compounds have been contained. Okay. One

cannot tell how that would affect the ease in which this land can be developed. These are all points to consider when looking at the future of available industrial, office park and retail land.

So my bottom line is this, our bottom line is this: Yes, this is wonderful industrial land. Yes, I hope it does get developed some day into industry that's going to further the life-style that we've all become accustomed to in this county, but to lock it up at this time way outside the urban growth boundary in strictly industrial land I think is shortsighted and myopic. So I would suggest that you not consider this property be put into the industrial land bank. Thank you. Any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Gilbert?

BARCA: I have a question.

GILBERT: Yes.

BARCA: Is it your contention, then, that it's the industrial land bank as a mechanism that you object to or is it that this land as industrial land in general is your objection? I heard you say that it may be good industrial land in the future, but you didn't want to lock it up with a master plan.

GILBERT: Well, there's absolutely no -- it abuts I-5, there's absolutely no doubt that it is, it is wonderful industrial, office park, retail, whatever, but it has -- to me it's locking it up into one particular category on all 115 acres that can be developed now because the industrial land bank allows that, it can be developed now provided the infrastructure gets put into place, it does not have to wait until the urban growth boundary gets out there. But that's taking a really good piece of industrial property, and I use the word "industrial" loosely rather than the tight meaning they have in the RCW. I think this land should be developed eventually when the urban growth boundary moves out according to what our needs are going to be at that time, but to take it and leap outside of the urban growth boundary into a very small category of either manufacturing or distribution and lock up that 115 acres I think is shortsighted on our part.

BARCA: So assuming that it's La Center's urban growth boundary that eventually broaches to the I-5 then, your position, and I'm assuming that of the neighborhood association is, there's no opposition to it becoming industrial?

GILBERT: Oh, no, there's no opposition to it, we don't want it residential or any of that. It would be foolish to recommend that. I'm talking about keeping it in a very narrow scope of basically manufacturing and distribution. I'd like to see whatever, whatever it is that come, I mean say for example Microsoft came down here and wanted to build their campus and we had 115 acres out there that they could have used and we couldn't do it because, I'm sorry, we can only have industrial, manufacturing or distribution. I think that's shortsighted. I think we need to keep -- stay flexible and keep that property available for whatever the need might be in an industrial way.

BARCA: I suspect if that was genuinely the case, though, that accommodations would be made for that to be made available, but I understand your point.

GILBERT: Well, the way I interpret the RCW it's very strict. Maybe I interpreting it wrong.

LEIN: Lonnie, did you have a question?

MOSS: Well, I was just wondering, it seems couldn't this same argument be made against zoning any particular property for a specific use then, that in fact what we are doing is precluding other potential uses of that property which might be beneficial or productive or economically feasible. I'm wondering why that argument applies only to this property and not to others?

GILBERT: Well, it may apply to others, this is the only one that happens to be up for the industrial land bank that I'm aware of. It's true that other pieces that you can't do that with every single piece of property, but this is well outside the urban growth boundary. This is one of the last large tracts of land along I-5 that's available and everybody's talking about how there isn't enough industrial, office park, whatever, land inside the urban growth boundary, that's why we're jumping out with this industrial land bank because somebody may come along who wants 115 acres and we don't have it inside the urban growth boundary.

Now I don't know if that's true, that will have to be discussed by you folks and to determine whether or not there is property with inside the urban growth boundary that can support industry and we don't have to jump out to 319th Street. But my thought particularly is this piece of property right now to be brought into when there's plenty of other industrial land available closer to the urban growth boundary and to lock it up into that seems to me to be shortsighted. Did I answer your question or not?

MOSS: I think so. Thanks.

GILBERT: Okay. It's real clear to me, you know. Anything else? Thanks.

LEIN: Thank you, Ms. Gilbert. Carol Levanen.

LEVANEN: Carol Levanen, 17614 NE 299th Street, Yacolt, Washington. I just stopped by just to see how things were going, I haven't been here for a while, but I guess another reason I stopped was for a young couple called me, they have 19 acres zoned 20 acres right now surrounded by two and a half and 5 acres and they need to sell land for money and they wanted to sell a 10-acre piece of property to some family and I suggested to them that I thought there was an avenue for them to do that now during the comprehensive plan review because as I understood, there would be site-specific areas being addressed through this process.

Now I'm not quite so sure, but I asked them to get some information together and I would

take a look at the maps and so forth to see if I think it's even something that's a feasible thing because I have a feeling -- it's at Fargher Lake and I have a feeling that that was in some of the agri-forest lands, and as I look at the Fargher Lake area it is surrounded with two and a half and 5-acre parcels with only a few, if even only maybe one, 20-acre piece surrounded by that, so they may have a good case. But I was looking at your map over here and I noticed some of these site-specific areas are dated back to 2002; is that true?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEVANEN: So these people have been waiting in the sidelines for three years?

LEIN: Correct.

LEVANEN: And so are you going to address these people so that they can get some closure to their, to their requests?

LEIN: We will have some discussion on that as we do deliberations.

LEVANEN: Okay. I mean I don't know whether or not this young couple would get information in in enough time to be addressed, but I have a concern that you have people that have been waiting since 2002 to be addressed. Now someone suggested that the annual review would be a better avenue for maybe these folks to go through, but why haven't these people been addressed through the annual review and so why are you reviewing them now. Have they been delayed or, you know, I guess I'm, I'm concerned for these people because they're waiting and they understand that there's an avenue now for them to have their land addressed finally after three years on some of them and I noticed a number of them are in the rural lands, they're out, you know, I always look at the Lewis River boundary and look above north of that and quite a few of these people are in those areas and I'm concerned that you're not going to take the time to give these people resolution and I don't believe that that's fair to these people who have applied for these.

So, you know, I'm sorry I don't have any site-specific requests other than I certainly hope that if these people publicly have been told that you are going to address these areas, then indeed you do address these areas and that you give a closure to these people. Because I don't know about you, but I've waited -- in some developments we've waited five, six years, it's not fun, and as they're waiting they are losing, they're losing in dollars, they're losing in time, they're losing in their mental capacity to deal with the stress that's put upon them. So hopefully you will address these people individually as has been promised or you let them know that you are not going to and that you give them another avenue to do that with. So that's just my comments.

LEIN: I think we'll have quite a bit of discussion on that with our deliberations. One of the issues is whether or not the rural area can even be brought into the final discussions on site-specific issues as part of this process. I think we share with you the concern that you have on some of the site-specific issues that have been around for a long time and may not be resolved at this particular juncture in time. They do have the annual review process,



there's a docket process that they might be able to get into, but I think that people have to sort of stay tuned as we do our deliberations and whether or not we can even address the rural area.

LEVANEN: I see. Another concern I have is the increase of population and the population projection increases and so forth. It's an interesting, not that I disagree with the work that's been done in the urban type areas, and this is something that you people know a lot more about than myself, I'm more concerned about rural areas, but it's a curiosity why none of the rural areas has been addressed for any kinds of zone change to allow for increased population within the county. Usually when comprehensive plans are gone over or reviewed, normally there's changes throughout the county and I'm really not seeing this. So I'm assuming those people in the rural lands are asking for a lesser zone than what they are and I think, you know, maybe this is an avenue to help address both issues, both population and resolution for these landowners. So just a thought. Thank you.

LEIN: Okay. Thank you. George Sundem. Mr. Sundem. Steve Horenstein.

HORENSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. For the record my name is Steve Horenstein, 500 Broadway, Suite 400, in Vancouver. I'd like to address two issues that I did not address in my rather lengthy testimony the last time I was here. One is the issue of the timing of capital facilities planning relative to the adoption of the land use plan, and the second one somewhat related is urban holding. We find ourselves at the end of an almost four-year process now with the land use plan, landing the plan on a land use plan, but a capital facilities plan that isn't close. That's a problem under the Growth Management Act because the Growth Management Act is a capital facilities based plan. And I know that there -- and I can in some ways I can understand why staff hasn't been able to get it done, but on the other hand it says a lot about the process that we should be almost four years into this and we haven't been able to do sort of the precondition to the viability and enforceability of the land use plan. I know the Commissioners are as they put it hell bent on getting this done before the end of the year, but let me give you pause to stop and think about that.

I think staff has acknowledged that a capital -- that a land use plan that goes up without a capital facilities plan that supports it is will be remanded just about as fast as it gets there. Please stop and think about what that means. That means all -- many of the landowners, many with not lots of money, have to become involved in the appeal process, have to go to the Hearings Board, we will extend the time frame for it all to get done, it probably takes -- it could take the better part of eight, ten months to get the remand done and then we're right kind of back to where we are today. Our request would be that we don't adopt the land use plan until we are ready to adopt a capital facilities plan at the same time. That's what the Growth Management Act contemplates, that is efficient, that's fair, and to do otherwise is very burdensome to not only the staff but to lots of other folks. There are ways to work that out, that kind of thing out, when you do get to the Hearings Board, but why would we all need to be involved in that, let's just slow down long enough to get the capital facilities plan done and move it along. In that regard, our hope would be that you deal with all of the issues of urban growth boundary and site-specific and all the things that are before you

and make recommendations on all those to the County Commissioners, but also recommend to them that they not proceed to finalize your recommendations until the capital facilities plan is done. It's hard to understand why anything else makes much sense.

Let me address urban holding for a minute. Urban holding as proposed by the City of Vancouver is in some parts of Vancouver if you just use Vancouver's urban growth boundary as an example problematic and probably not legally defensible risking that the entire plan is not valid. The issue of real concern is the requirement for a subarea plan as an alternative to annexation. Many areas in the Vancouver urban growth boundary are not even close to the municipal city limits at this point and may not be for 10, 15, 20 years, may become part of a new city or the incorporation of Hazel Dell in some sort of way, all that stuff is out there away, but therein lies the problem. A subarea plan for areas that the City of Vancouver doesn't provide the service for may create a requirement that can never be met for a piece of property to come out of urban holding. The City -- and neither the City or the County can compel Hazel Dell Sewer District, Clark PUD, other service providers, to participate in a subarea plan. So if you're not close to the boundary for years and years, the municipal boundary, and there's no way legally to enforce the subarea plan requirement, you're in a real state of limbo. I suspect the Hearings Board would look askance at that and it's another thing we probably shouldn't have to litigate.

I use the City of Vancouver as an example for two reasons. Number one, they're promoting what they're promoting. And also a real good example of this would be the area where you have numerous proposals, not just from my office but from others as well, along 119th Street going east and west of 117th, all those areas can be fairly readily served by Hazel Dell Sewer and PUD Water way far away from the Vancouver municipal boundary, no reasonable chance of annexation any time soon, but you couldn't do a subarea plan there, can't annex, can't do a subarea plan. So I would ask that you give some thought to if you are going to proceed with urban holding, think through what I've said and perhaps modify the language some. It's probably not particular just to Vancouver, I suspect that we would have these situations in many places in the North County where the service providers are not the Cities. So although I haven't thought through those examples, I'm sure if you think about it you could come up with some more. So two things that I'm recommending tonight that I think will make this process more defensible, more legitimate, less financially burdensome on the County and the residents of the community and things that comply with the Act to just make sense. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Horenstein?

SMITH: Then you're agreeing with John Karpinski on the first part of your --

HORENSTEIN: I, you know, you'd be surprised, occasionally we do agree.

SMITH: And what's even more amazing you're suggesting we minimize future litigation.

HORENSTEIN: I'm saying that too, yeah.

SMITH: Gees, are you feeling okay, Steve?

HORENSTEIN: Yes, I am. Yes, I am. We have plenty of productive things to do. I guess my request is that you don't create litigation that we have to participate in.

BARCA: I do have a question. In your statement here it says it may not be legally possible to even bring some parcels out of urban holding in areas where for example Hazel Dell Sewer District and Clark PUD provide service, and the reason that it may not be possible would be?

HORENSTEIN: Because you can't compel them to participate in a subarea plan.

BARCA: Do we have existing circumstances in which they've chosen not to participate in subarea plans?

HORENSTEIN: There's never been a need for them to that I know of. But there's generally significant competition between Cities that provide services and those two, that's pretty -- you could take judicial notice of that. It's the legal issue there, Ron, would be the fact that even though they might or they might not, you can't compel them so you could never do -- as a matter of law you could never be sure you could do a subarea plan. And if you're too far away to annex, you've got an urban holding designation that may not work.

BARCA: Okay.

HORENSTEIN: Thank you very much.

LEIN: Dan George.

GEORGE: Good evening, members of the Planning Commission. My name is Dan George, I'm with Planning Solutions, Inc., our offices are located at 1508 Broadway, Vancouver, Washington 98663. I'm here this evening on behalf of East Woods Presbyterian Church, that would be SSR2003-116. And I thank you for the opportunity to provide supplemental testimony to you, some of the testimony has been provided a little earlier. I have prepared a letter that I'd like to distribute at this time, I'd like to have this admitted into the record. It is -- it addresses the approval criteria for granting a rezone and also provides a land use analysis. I'd like to get maybe one of those back as a stamped copy, please. Also I'd like to place on the overhead a few aerials that I'll be referring to throughout the presentation.

The letter that I've just submitted is quite detailed and I plan to only go through a very brief overview of that. I'd certainly be happy to entertain specific questions. Once again it addresses the approval criteria, how the rezone, the requested rezone, would be consistent with comp plan goals and policies, also establishes that there is a substantial change in conditions in the area and the rezone would be in the best interest of the public and adequate urban services are currently available at the site. And here we go, I'd like to

go ahead and point out the site just for reference as I go through this presentation.

The word "site" is a little dark with the background, but it primarily is this area. And it's a wooded tract. Just for reference purposes, this is the entrance to Cimarron subdivision here, this is existing single-family residence, this is the townhouses for Stein Estate both in this area and this area. These are single-family detached for Stein Estates. This is the QFC that we're probably mostly familiar with, 18th in this location, another commercial district that's located within the city of Vancouver zoned community commercial. We have community commercial district here, here, also in this area, and then also there is an isolated portion of another C-3 district that actually appears to be MX but it's part of the Stein townhouse plan, this is the 30 percent that was designated for neighborhood commercial both here and in this location.

Now that we've kind of referenced the site, our request is to change the zoning of the site. Currently the site is light industrial ML and we're requesting the zone change to community commercial C-3. And under the current comprehensive plan designation mixed use the C-3 district would implement the current comprehensive plan in mixed use so we believe that a comp plan amendment is not necessary to approve this action. And we also find that this is an excellent opportunity that we have before us. This is in essence the only light industrial that's left out of a larger tract that previously existed, but as part of this, this body, this Commission, you're considering numerous other parcels that have far greater potential for light industrial, so the opportunity exists here to take this land and this light industrial land and allocate it to another location where it would be far more compatible.

What we have also done over the last few days, we have contacted the neighborhoods that are located in this area. You'll find letters from three neighborhood associations that are in the rear of my submittal. And those neighbors are Cimarron subdivision, this location, Stein townhomes, here and here again, and then the Shanako Ridge Homeowner's Association. And what we very consistently hear from those letters is no ML in this location, please give us community commercial, and also please allow a church to be established at this location. Now we recognize the fact that this Commission does not have authority to be the final authority in granting the ability of a church to be located on the site, but under the current zoning of ML a church is not permitted, so therefore a zone change is necessary as the first step to allow a church to go forward on this site.

Now what we see from a land use standpoint that there have been very significant changes that have occurred in this area goes towards fulfilling the criteria for a zone change. Just a very brief overview. In 1992 the urban growth boundary was roughly right in this area, this was all zoned agriculture and the church purchased the site, and you'll find a Statutory Warranty Deed in the back of my submittal as well too establishing that the property was purchased in September of '92. Prior to that the church went, had a pre-application conference with Clark County which indicated that a church could be constructed under the current ag zoning for that site through a conditional use permit process. Subsequently in 1994 a process that I believe we're all very familiar with through the comp plan, the countywide comp plan process, this site was rezoned to mixed use as a comprehensive plan designation and light industrial ML as a zoning district, and at that time much of this

land all through here also was zoned light industrial, and I think the zoning district now is down at this point.

After 1994, again in the late '90s, a rezone request came in for the Stein property. This site in this location. The Stein property proposed a rezone to mixed use which now we see has been built out substantially that allocated 70 percent of the land roughly for single-family residential and 30 percent for commercial. So in essence, as a result of that zone change for Stein Estates this remnant now exists as the only light industrial in this area. If I could maybe have the zoning map up, please, at this point. The blue area would represent the existing zoning in the area, the light industrial. This is a C-3 that is part of the mixed use 70/30 split. This is mixed use C-3. This is zoned C-3 outright, and here we have a community commercial, a similar zoning district in the city. What we find is that this site exists as an isolated remnant, it also isolates the upper portion of the C-3 district in this area. What our proposal would be is to change this site to C-3. It would provide a very nice degree of continuity in the district, it would provide very good compatibility, and it would also allow the church to go forward.

One of the things that we see with this church is that it has an opportunity to provide a community core for this little district. The church has agreed to provide their facilities through the week for neighborhood functions, community meetings, neighborhood meetings, things of this nature. The church plans to provide some recreational facilities for children, along with a number of other services that would be beneficial to the public as a whole. That site as it exists today is a little under 5 acres, about 4.9 acres. If we were looking at this as a stand-alone proposal, I don't believe a 5-acre site would really make sense to establish a stand-alone district for light industrial. Light industrial would benefit greatly from having closer proximity to a larger area. Additionally, with the build-out of the single-family residential, and, Evan, if I might ask you again, I think there are a couple of photographs that we could run through very quickly, and I'm almost done, just photographs of the Stein townhomes, again our lot is very easy to pick out because of the large Evergreen trees, there are larger trees in that area, so all back in this area you see proximity here to the existing single-family residential. Next photo, please. Thank you.

This is QFC, we're all familiar with as well. Once again the trees tend to depict our property. QFC is in this location, I think it's Riverview Bank that's here. Once again the frontage is on 162nd and the site exists where the trees are located. So what we see when we see this existing single-family residential, we see the commercial, I see a very likelihood of incompatibility. I see the potential for adverse impacts if this light industrial district is in fact built out. I see the potential for noise conflicts, for odors, for visual impacts, transportation impacts of having large trucks trying to enter this site, and I also see an impact on property values. What we saw are very close proximity homes to this industrial area. So we believe that C-3 would be in the best interest of the community. It would provide a better connection, it would provide, again, better continuity, it would also result in fewer visual impacts, it would provide a community center for this area, and it would also provide a better configuration for that commercial node, it would allow those commercial districts to connect and not exist as a segregated portion to the north with this small district interjected in the center.

So with that, in summary we would ask that the Planning Commission would make recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to rezone the property. We believe that the criteria that we have provided will support the rezone. We believe that the rezone is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan, provides better compatibility. We believe it's the best land use for the site. We have a commitment from a church that that is the intended use for the site. We also have very strong support from the neighborhoods. I would very much ask you to read the letters. I find the letters very eloquent and very to the point, both from a land use standpoint and from an interest standpoint of the neighborhoods. And we also ask that you would restore the development rights that was taken away as part of the rezone to allow this church to go forward. And by acting on this as part of a site-specific review we do have the opportunity to also have this result in no net loss of industrial lands. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. George?

RUPLEY: Mr. George, in the plans that the church has for building a church, is there a school also in the plan?

GEORGE: I'm not aware of a school, that would be part of the site plan review slash I think potentially a conditional use permit.

AUDIENCE: There is no school.

GEORGE: Excuse me?

AUDIENCE: There is no school at this time planned for this site.

SMITH: I notice there is ML just across the C-3 from you to the south, that's an aggregate place I guess; isn't it?

GEORGE: That's correct. The district actually extends further to the south off of the map. It's a very large area and that's what we more traditionally see is a large aggregate of land dedicated for ML.

SMITH: That's heavily impacted by high tension wires as I recall too on the site.

LEIN: I believe that a lot of that property is owned by Vancouver Clark Parks and Recreation now.

GEORGE: Yes.

SMITH: It's a doggy park.

GEORGE: Yes. Right. And I think this is where the high tension wires are, and I think maybe there is another line through this area right here.

LEIN: Any other questions of Mr. George? Thank you.

GEORGE: Thank you very much.

LEIN: Betty Brooking. Andy.

BROOKING: Yeah.

LEIN: Okay, thank you.

BROOKING: Yeah, I'm Andrew Brooking, here on behalf of my parents Emil and Dory Brooking. And just to add a little bit to what Mr. Bishop over here said earlier about the, my parents parcel, a letter he has sent to the Board and possibly you Commissioners also, I'm not sure, but to make sure that you realize that my parents' property is designated as open space as of 2000, I mean excuse me, 1993, and also it is under a conservation easement grant deed which is held by the Columbia Land Trust. So keeping that in mind, with this property being designated as a business park those two items definitely are not compatible. So hopefully this is just a staff oversight and it can be resolved quite easily. Thank you. Any questions?

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Brooking? Thank you.

BROOKING: Thank you.

LEIN: Connie Durkee.

AUDIENCE: No, she's left. She had to leave.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. That completes the sign-up list. Is there anyone else in the audience wishing to testify? We have another list.

HIGBIE: There's only one on it.

LEIN: Thank you. MH Kepcha.

KEPCHA: You already got me.

LEIN: Okay. Anyone else wishing to testify? All right. Then we will turn to the Planning Commission and we will take a brief break before we start deliberations. That ends public testimony. Thank you.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: We'd like to reconvene the hearing. Mr. Lee.

LEE: I think at this time we are ready to give staff presentation on the comprehensive plan and have deliberations on that.

LEIN: Okay. Please proceed.

ORJIAKO: Thank you, Pat, and members of the Planning Commission. For the record Oliver Orjiako, Long-Range Planning Division. I do not plan to go through the testimony that I gave the Planning Commission the last time we had a hearing on the plan text. I believe that staff did summarize the major policy changes as a result of this plan update primarily focusing on the major countywide planning policies that are new, so I don't intend to go through that at this deliberation unless you have specific questions.

One area that we did stress at the last hearing on the plan text has to do with the no net loss. We did indicate to the Planning Commission that we raised the issue with the Cities. And we not only raised that issue, we raised it because we felt that it was important for consideration, but we didn't reach a consensus on what the County planning policies ought to be on the no net loss question. You did receive testimony from the Cities of Battle Ground indicating that they no -- they wanted no part of the no net loss; however, you did also receive testimony from the other jurisdictions, Camas, Ridgefield, wanting the no net loss to employee base type of policy. The City of Vancouver currently has a no net loss proposed in their own comp plan text.

What we would recommend to the Planning Commission is to in your deliberation if you concur with staff that this is an issue that ought to be considered countywide, that you make that recommendation to the Board. One thing that we staff would recommend is that we extend the no net loss to the business park district. We will also -- however the language is worded we will also try -- we will also recommend that we apply the no net loss or we remove the tertiary land. The way that the existing no net loss is written it extends the no net loss to the secondary and tertiary lands. If you remove the -- if you don't apply the no net loss to the tertiary land, we will take that language to the Board as well. Some of the concerns have been that, as you know, if the tertiary lands, it's up to, you know, some folks will debate whether the tertiary lands really ought to be considered as industrial or be allowed to remain in the inventory. There is some concern that some of those tertiary land in terms of their classification are difficult to develop. So when you apply the no net loss to the tertiary land it makes it difficult also to make a strong case as to why you want to continue to leave it in the inventory.

So my recommendation will be however you recommend or whatever language we take to the Board that that not be extended to include the tertiary classification. There are very, very minor changes that we've made to the text. I don't, I don't intend to bore you with those, but we will make some of those technical corrections and forward a recommendation to the Board. That concludes my summary.

LEIN: Are there questions of Mr. Orjiako?

BARCA: I have a procedural question. Are we looking at the aspect of going through



potential comp plan changes, policy changes, with the start of this one?

ORJIAKO: Yes. What you going to be deliberating on is the draft comprehensive plan text and there are policies that are contained within it. What I did at the last hearing was to summarize the major policy changes that are new and the other changes are technical in nature and housekeeping. And I didn't go through each one of them, only to highlight the major ones, and particularly where we did not reach consensus with the City on a countywide planning policy dealing with the no net loss. So I don't know whether you want me to go through those policies again, but if you have any specific questions on the plan text, I'd be more than willing to go on a particular page or a particular policy to address any concerns that you may have, but I felt that highlighting the major ones the more appropriate way to go.

BARCA: Okay. And my question actually was for the Chair.

LEIN: We could go through and see if there's any questions from members of the Commission on each of the chapters as outlined in the staff report summary of September 10th that we received from Mr. Lee and if there are no questions with respect to example Land Use Element or questions, then we could move on to the Housing Element. Is that satisfactory?

WRISTON: That's a start.

LEIN: Okay. Let's start with --

WRISTON: Minor changes.

LEIN: -- the minor changes which that ends up being Chapter 1, Land Use Element.

RUPLEY: Where?

LEIN: Looking at the September 10th memo, it should be in the front of your book. If you don't have it, I've got an extra memo here.

RUPLEY: I actually have one.

MOSS: Let's see, just bring me up to speed here. Why do we have a difference in chapter numbering in between these two documents? I think that was explained before. The Land Use Element in Chapter 2 and this is Chapter 1 over here.

ORJIAKO: I think we made some numbering changes. We had -- in the existing comp plan we had Chapter 1 as the Community Framework Plan, we've made that the introductory chapter. And then Chapter 1 becomes the land use chapter. And what I gave you last time was a good example of strike out and underline just to give you an idea that the copy that you have is a clean copy. If the underline and strike out is a good example, that will give you an indication of the type of technical changes and grammatical changes

we're making, but the changes are not significant in nature.

LEIN: There's really no relationship between the tab numbers and the chapter numbers?

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

LEIN: I think that was confusing at the beginning. So are there any questions on the Chapter 1, Land Use Element, especially on the urban/rural population split?

MOSS: Yeah. I got to get to there, just a second.

RUPLEY: Is this just a strike out version?

LEIN: That's a strike out version of what's in there. There's, what, two or three chapters attached there.

RUPLEY: When did we get this?

LEIN: We got that in a workshop two workshops ago.

BARCA: So it's in my pile somewhere.

WRISTON: I remember going through it but --

RUPLEY: So all the difference is is just this is strike out and highlighted version though?

LEIN: That shows you the highlight, yes.

BARCA: So I have a question, then, based on what we're seeing right up front. If indeed we go through the rest of the assumptions, including the capital facilities portion of this, and we come to some consensus that says based on how far away we are on the value of the growth plan, what we can afford and what is deemed appropriate by this Board, the 1.83 percent growth factor may no longer be an appropriate number from the Board if we adopt that number now, and if we adopt a 90/10 rural split and then it turns out that that no longer becomes appropriate at the end of the process, do we then have to go back and change that?

ORJIAKO: If I may answer that question. If that's the outcome, unless Pat or Rich will jump in, it is likely that we will amend the text to reflect that.

BARCA: Okay. So then for the rest of my esteemed colleagues is this the appropriate time to codify those assumptions or do we want to roll that into the end of the process? I mean we change language all the time, we can change it two or three times during the process, but it's just if we see right up front that it may become an issue do we start that way?

LEIN: Well, there's two ways to approach that I think. One is to go through the comp plan changes and make comments and not adopt them until the end; the other is to go through and adopt them as we go. If you wanted to run the safer to make sure that the issue is being addressed and not adopted until we get through everything, then I would say that we don't vote on anything until we get through with everything. If that makes sense.

ORJIAKO: One other thing, staff will add on the growth rate and the other assumptions. As you may recall, those are planning assumptions that guide us in the development of the plan, it may not just -- it may not be had policy, but it is a guiding assumption that we used in the development of the plan. We put it in here as a reference point, but is -- I don't think is a had bad policy. And I'm not sure that what your recommendation to the Board, whatever changes that are made, I don't see the 1.83, the 2.69, the 90/10 split as a had policy, it is a planning assumption and guidance in the development of the plan. If indeed these capital facilities plan as you're alluding to was prepared, any changes in any of the planning assumptions or, you know, change our level-of-service for example, I'm sure that we're going to make the changes to reflect that in terms of assumptions if you will, but the guidance here is planning assumptions and guidance in the development of the plan. I see Rich standing up so he may add something to that.

LOWRY: Rich Lowry, County Prosecutor's Office. Whether this plan gets adopted this year or put off until the capital facilities plan catches up, we needed to land on a land use map in order to complete the capital facilities plan analysis. So I think you need to act on each of these issues. Whether that action once it gets to the Board level turns out to get memorialized in adoption of the plan or simply as the basis upon which capital facilities planning will be completed doesn't really matter, we still need to get these things nailed down so that we have a concrete plan to base capital facilities planning on.

BARCA: Okay. And I think I understand that aspect of it, of needing to have whatever changes are going to be put in place initially established. My concern was that this Board ends up driving out a new set of terms by which we feel like we can pass a comprehensive plan forward to the Board of County Commissioners and that numbers such as the 90/10 split or the 1.83 percent growth factor are no longer applicable directly to our recommendation where then there's a numerical conflict and I just wanted to know what the mechanism was for balancing that text with our final outcome.

LOWRY: What GMA specifically says in regard to the CFP for roads is if you can't balance the CFP with a land use plan, then you have to revisit the land use plan. So if the capital facilities is unable to catch up, then revisiting the assumptions and the land use plan is going to have to occur. But we're not going to know that for sure until a lot more work is done on capital facilities, including level-of-service analysis, including testing the CFP on a 6 year rather than a 20 year basis, including looking at what potential there is for focused public investment and phased bringing in new areas in a staged or phased way. But these assumptions always are open to reassessment if that's the only way we can make the plan work as a whole.

BARCA: Is that clear?

MOSS: I think it's clear that staff needs some kind of an assumption for a land use element to use to model their capital facilities plan, but I'm not sure that that needs to be a recommendation of this Planning Commission. We already have what appears to be a preferred alternative from the Board of County Commissioners which I would assume that you would work with in the absence of anything else. And I'm wondering do you need anything further than that to use as a basis for your capital facilities plan model?

LEE: I think that we're not into that discussion at this point in time. Obviously we'll be discussing the potential of moving around some proposed land uses, possibly minor adjustments to the proposed urban growth boundary, et cetera, as we get further into the deliberations that may affect travel demand patterns for the transportation element for example and we would probably -- after the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the Board we would probably do another run of the travel model to see what that provides us in terms of addressing some of the capital facilities needs.

Personally I think that -- well, personally I would steer you away from revisiting assumptions of population, et cetera. I think we had two years of -- the first two years of this process were involved in identifying a set of assumptions to guide planning which was then folded into the five different alternatives and using similar although not across the board but there was a lot of different alternatives that could accommodate similar assumptions across those alternatives in terms of what the actual land use pattern is and I don't think there is a need to revisit those since, as you indicated, the Board once again revisited them and made some changes to those assumptions back in July when they selected the preferred alternative and I think it would be better to proceed from there with those assumptions. If there are policies, actually policies in here that are some troublesome, then certainly we should have a discussion of those. But I really don't think that revisiting all the assumptions is where we need to go at this point in time.

BARCA: I don't see how we're going to get away from revisiting the assumptions. But for the sake of getting these changes down, I'm happy to go through them and accept what has been done as a foundation and then we'll get deeper into it and see how well it holds up. So this seems like it's somewhat procedural and I don't want to drag it down to a debate on each one of these when there's a lot more to discuss into the plan.

LEIN: What are you talking about each chapter then, Ron? Is that what you're saying, there's no need to go through?

BARCA: No. What I was saying is I can pretty much go through these chapters in short order and not get myself wrapped into the assumptions on the chapters at this particular point in time, it will be when we're trying to balance the whole plan out that I think we're going to have to get back into the assumptions.

LEIN: Okay. Let's continue on then. Anything else on the Land Use Element? Lonnie.

MOSS: Well, I, yeah, I don't mean to distract us from where we're going, but I'm a little

confused about something. I just had a question on some of the numbers and on one of the numbers in Table 1.2, and this relates to the population projection between urban and rural, the unincorporated rural area in 2000 had a population of 166,000 and yet we show the projected population in 2023 as being 80,000. How does that work?

LEE: Which, are you on Table 1.2, Lonnie?

MOSS: Yes, I am. Uh-huh, Page 1-4.

LEIN: Table 1.2, second line down to the far right. It's a decrease of 86,000 people.

MOSS: You know, acknowledging that the urban growth boundaries are expanding and less area is going to be rural, that seems like a dramatic decrease for minor expansions of the urban growth boundary. What, is that just a typo? I don't remember the numbers exactly, but the 166,000 seems like a vastly overstated number.

LEE: I think -- well, one thing that may have been -- well, I don't know in the 2000, it does seem like, you're right, it does seem like an (inaudible) number.

MOSS: I thought the population of Rural Clark County was more like 60,000.

LEE: Yeah, it is. And --

MOSS: And in fact that may be the case. If you add everything up there it's clearly going to add up to more than 345,000 in 2000.

ORJIAKO: It is something that we can flag and make sure, I can provide you (inaudible) at this moment.

MOSS: Well, just, you know, just looking at the big numbers here, the unincorporated rural area 166, the unincorporated urban area 178 plus the Vancouver city limits, those three add up to way more than 345.

LEE: My recollection, although I don't know absolutely, is that you're right, we may have that extra digit. I think it's more like existing population is like about 66,000 or something like that as opposed to 166.

MOSS: But the numbers I don't believe are right anyway though. We have a 1990 population of 173 and it drops to 166 in 2000. I don't think that happened, but, okay.

LEE: Okay. Well, we'll double-check the numbers in the table.

SMITH: Isn't that a function of incorporating more areas though?

LEE: That's certainly part of it. I mean you had the whole Cascade Park annexation during that period and that might have an effect on how the numbers are but --

MOSS: But that didn't reduce the rural area.

LEE: -- (inaudible) the rural population it's, yeah, it's the number seems, seems off.

BARCA: Yeah, the unincorporated rural and urban, you add those two numbers up in 2000 and they equal 345,000.

ORJIAKO: Yeah, we'll check that.

BARCA: So we'll let you get back at us.

LEIN: Any other comments on the Land Use Element? Then move on to the Housing Element in Chapter 2. You see some of the same figures there in Table 2.1 that may need to be confirmed also.

LEE: Yes.

MOSS: Well, I've got a comment on the housing element that I'd like to make and that's with regard to housing affordability which is a key component within GMA. Now it appears to me that the policies that we're laying out here in this county right now are specifically directed to increase the cost of housing and stop the influx of population, and I think if we're going to be honest about that we ought to adopt a planned policy that says that that's what we're doing. We appear to have that policy emanating from the Board of County Commissioners. And while that's their right, I think to establish what our growth policy is going to be, I don't believe that we ought to have a plan that states the opposite.

RUPLEY: Lonnie, are you looking, then, under the "Housing Element Requirements"?

MOSS: Yeah, I'm looking under the "Relationship To Other Elements And Plans" right at the bottom of the first page of the Housing Element where it talks about housing affordability being a key component within the Growth Management legislation. It appears to me that that housing affordability is no longer a goal here in Clark County and many of the policies that we appear to be adopting right now are directed toward actually increasing the cost of housing here as a mechanism to stop or at least slow growth. Now if that's the case I think we ought to get rid of the double speak here and adopt a plan policy that says that.

RUPLEY: I'm going to ask you the question. If you go to the next page where you look for the Housing Element Requirements, they talk on the fourth one it says "identify sufficient housing or land for housing including," and then they list several specific areas. And so I'm wondering if that is what's addressing affordability by addressing affordability with specific populations versus overall affordability like you're describing it?

MOSS: Well, I don't think that you can address housing affordability in relative terms, I think you have to address it in absolute terms. And while you can provide a variety of

housing types as one mechanism for ensuring that there's affordable housing somewhere in the spectrum, in fact when you adopt policies that run the cost of housing up across the board I think that your goal of housing affordability is no longer your goal.

RUPLEY: Becomes your anti-goal?

MOSS: Well, it's, you know, I don't think that it's my position as a Planning Commission member to necessarily adopt or, excuse me, accept all of the policies that come out of the Board of County Commissioners. And I've heard publicly stated from at least one Commission member that housing affordability is something that that Commissioner doesn't want to talk about anymore and I'm a little bothered by that, that we have, we have a stated comp plan policy that says that we will have housing affordability and yet that seems to be just something that we put in the plan and don't have any policy, any actual planned elements to encourage such affordability.

LEIN: Lonnie, I'd encourage you to go to Page 2-16 under "Summary And Conclusions" I think there's quite a bit of time spent here in terms of recognizing the concern on affordable housing, especially in that last paragraph at the bottom of that page. You know, it says "in order to provide the housing needed by the low and middle income population, it will be necessary for the county, cities, state and the private sector to create new working relationships if the needs for financing, construction or acquisition and maintenance of housing are to be met." I think that this chapter recognizes it. There may not be a specific policy how to get there and maybe that's the part that's bothering you.

MOSS: Well, one of the things that's bothering me is look at the third paragraph on that same page it says "the cost for land and construction of new housing has been increasing rapidly over the past five years. If the trend continues, then there will be even less affordable new housing built in the county. The needs of middle as well as lower income households will be more difficult to meet with new housing." I think all of that is very accurately stated and yet I think that the current direction is to adopt policies, including a lack of expansion sufficiently to keep land costs down that actually encourage or discourage us from meeting housing affordability goals, and I'm very concerned that we're artificially constraining the land supply intentionally to drive the cost of housing up here.

You know, we've had this discussion at times in the past even among the Planning Commission members here where we've -- where I have acknowledged that there is a school of thought that says that we ought to run the cost of housing up in this county and thereby slow down the rate of growth. There are some people who think that that's a good idea, I personally don't and I'm, I guess I'm looking at this plan and deciding which is it that we're trying to implement. If we're serious about keeping the cost of housing down, then these kinds of policies ought to stay in here. Or this kind of language ought to stay. If we're not, then I think it ought to be removed. Having said that, I'll get off that soapbox and let the discussion continue.

LEIN: Any other comments on this issue?

WRISTON: No. I mean I understand exactly what Lonnie's saying. I mean we -- there is no doubt that the cost of housing as -- I mean that third paragraph there is absolutely no doubt that that's true, and I don't think there's absolutely no doubt that the trend's going to continue unless there's interest rates and other things, but, you know, that will maybe put us into another economic spiral, but I think it will continue. And then even if interest rates start going down again, it will probably recontinue even if that changed. But I think he's right, I think the question was, is probably more of one whether it's relative or absolute. I don't think we're -- I think it's more that we're restricting land to control growth, I think that's been the policy, which in turn by controlling the growth and limiting land supply, it's all supply and demand, that's going to drive up, it's economics, I mean that's going to drive up the costs of housing. I don't know if we're intentionally doing that to -- I don't think we're intentionally, I don't know if you meant to say that, I don't think we're intentionally driving up the cost of housing to control growth.

MOSS: No, actually I did mean that.

WRISTON: Oh, did you. Yeah. I don't know. I think we're intentionally, I think there's a policy to, I mean that's the whole population projection where the, you know, that's, we're doing that to control growth or it's that controls growth and in turn raises housing prices, but I don't know if we're intentionally, if anyone's intentionally. But maybe you've heard something that I haven't heard probably; right?

MOSS: Well, let me explain why I said what I did. There isn't anything about selecting a population figure that directly limits the amount of population that comes into the county. Indirectly what happens, though, is if you don't plan for enough urban growth boundary expansion, then there are too many people competing for too little land and the price of that land goes up, the price of housing goes up, people are discouraged from moving here, relocating here because the cost isn't as low as it used to be and the net effect is that you can get a goal accomplished if that is your goal. I'm just not an advocate of that type of social engineering, if you will.

WRISTON: Right. No, I actually I just thought of -- I don't know if anyone remembers Troy Rayburn, do you guys remember, he moved to Aspen, Colorado to be I think he's like director of affordable housing or something like that, so therein lies the, there's an example of relative or absolute probably, (inaudible) just reminded me of that in terms of I mean that's, it's a tough issue, there's no doubt that we, that the land, I mean it's just going crazy right now and single-family lots are going crazy.

LEIN: Lonnie, I would counter, I don't think it's something that the County itself is imposing, I think it's a result of GMA. It's been dictated you will do more development and density within the existing, sorry, the existing urban growth areas, that by itself is going to make less land available, and when less land is available the price is going to go up which impacts the price of housing. So I don't think it's just a County factor, I think it's part of GMA and the plan to make land more usable in terms of the density aspect of it. So I don't think it's really just a County policy, I think it's something that is going to be provided statewide on any county that has to go through GMA.



MOSS: You know, that could be the case, but we have done an awful lot that has been counterproductive as far as ensuring that though, Vaughn. If you look at some of the changes that we made in comp plan policies already going into this plan, for example the inclusion of parcels two and a half acres and smaller which weren't included in the vacant buildable lands inventory before. The, excuse me, I'm losing my voice here.

LEIN: Aren't we lucky.

RUPLEY: Take the water away from him.

MOSS: The deletion of the market factor and coupled with what I believe to be, and I believe what this Planning Commission believes to be, a low -- the adoption of a very low population projection factor, one which was considerably lower than this Planning Commission recommended at the beginning of this, I think all of those policies together have a net adverse effect and I don't believe that those were adopted in a vacuum.

BARCA: But since we're not planning in a vacuum, and of course that would mean we're taking in regional considerations and not just the county exclusively in the context of supply and demand, when you speak of affordable housing what is the specific target that you're referring to? Is it owner occupied? Is it median income?

MOSS: No, it's all of those.

BARCA: Well, there must be some strata in which you say is affordable versus what isn't because the housing boom hasn't really abated, there's still plenty of houses being built, people are affording them, what's happening, though, is there are specific strata of our citizenry that's being left behind. So I'm trying to understand who is the target when you speak of this and, you know, at what income level are we really debating that they are the ones being left behind, because in the aspect of building homes there's plenty of homes being built and there's plenty of people that can afford --

MOSS: Actually there's plenty of homes being built and there's plenty of market out there and let me speak to the rural element if I can for a moment. One of the observations that I've made here before and I'd like to make again is that we have adopted policies I believe that have made housing unaffordable for people who are traditionally the rural residents of this county and I'm talking about kids like mine. That doesn't mean that homes and property aren't selling in the rural area, as a matter of fact it's selling at a very high rate. There

is -- we now have a situation where the average 5-acre lot in this county sells for in excess of \$125,000. Anybody that wants to build a home on that expensive a piece of property is going to build something that's probably in the neighborhood of \$300,000 plus.

Now what that means is is that the whole character of rural Clark County has changed because we have the, we have the haves who can afford to live there and the have nots who can't. And I'm concerned about the have nots, I'm concerned about the average

people who should be able to live in rural Clark County, and I'm concerned from the same aspect about those folks who would like to live in an owner occupied home, starter home in this county. I think any of us who read the paper have seen what's happened to the cost of housing here, that the average house price, I think selling price, has risen to what is it \$196,000. You know, I'm not concerned that we're not going to have plenty of people to buy the houses that are out there, what I am concerned about is that ordinary people who live in this county and who ought to have a right to live in this county are finding more and more often that they can't get into the single-family market because it's unaffordable.

I think the only thing that's kept that from happening at an even quicker pace is that we've had record low interest rates here for some time, that's bound to turn around, and I think that what we're going to find is that we have a huge segment of our population here in this county that's going to be completely out of the single-family home market. I think that's a shame. I'd hate to see that happen. I'll end my soliloquy on that.

BARCA: I just don't believe we could supply enough low cost homes regardless of the mechanism to put them in place that you wouldn't have the entire metro region rushing over to fill the bill and you would still end up with a supply and demand issue. So I believe as Vaughn pointed out in the text of the Summary And Conclusions it's probably most appropriate to target the population strata that we're most concerned about and be able to have mechanisms put in place to try and deal with those specifically because market driven forces are imbalanced when we deal with a region as a whole.

MOSS: Are you suggesting that we only ought to look at subsidized housing as our affordability element?

BARCA: I'm suggesting that "affordability" is a definition that has to be taken in a regional context and it can no longer be exclusive to Clark County's design because as I know firsthand there are plenty of people willing to drive from Gresham to Battle Ground for the sake of finding a house that they consider affordable, there's people that are willing to cross the entire Highway 26 stretch and work out somewhere in Hillsboro for the sake of getting a house in the lower \$120,000 range just to throw out a number. I just don't believe you could really create enough affordable lots to supply the metro region in the fashion that you're talking about in the current market.

MOSS: And the alternative to that is to dry up the supply and run the price up.

BARCA: The alternative is to deal with the citizenry that we feel is most affected and to come up with mechanisms that are local for dealing with them.

MOSS: And are we doing that?

BARCA: Based on the text that I see in the Summary And Conclusions the answer is no. Should we do it, the answer is yes.

LEIN: I don't disagree with you, Lonnie. We've discussed this, you know, for months now

in terms of the housing issue and it's gone back to, you know, several years ago, you know, the family living wage, the housing, the affordable houses, how do you address that.

I don't think anybody has the answer even though I think pretty much everybody's in agreement it should be done, but it's driven by the people doing the developing as well as the availability of land. If the land isn't available, you're going to pay a higher price, which in some cases means you put a lesser quality residence on it in order to make it affordable, and then that doesn't help anything because pretty soon because the construction quality isn't very good and the maintenance doesn't occur, you start seeing areas that are looking downtrodden and that doesn't help the community itself or you get developers in and it's at high end on the same piece of property and it's only affordable for those people who can afford the high end homes.

SMITH: And by increasing the buildable lands we're also like Ron said, we'll have a land rush over here from the other side and then it's increasing our bedroom community situation where we're subsidizing housing for folks living in Portland. But I agree with your problems too, it's a heck, I don't know that there's an easy answer.

DELEISSEGUES: I think the only way we can address this is to go by a reasonable assumption of growth and I think we've done that, we certainly have looked at both sides of what we feel the growth rate is going to be and we've pretty much settled on 1.82 as being a reasonable growth rate that we should plan for. And maybe it's a little higher, maybe it's a little lower, but that's where we are right now and we've gone through that. I think if we plan for say five percent growth and we made the land available for that, we certainly would have a land rush, we certainly would fill that, and we probably would have five percent growth, it wouldn't be an assumption, it would be a fact. The next time we would do the planning cycle we would have to project the growth at that rate and sooner or later we're going to get where we are now where you don't have the land to continue development. I think the only rational approach is to go back to agreeing on what we think the growth rate is going to be and plan for that and I'm sure when we get to the capital facility element, we're going to take another look at that. Either that or we're not going to be in compliance with what we're here to do.

SMITH: And part, another part of the affordability issue is Chapter 9, Economic Development. If we can get more family wage jobs some of these houses that are rising in prices are going to be affordable for our people. We can't just think of our people as being only able to afford so much, we've got to make the economic climate to the point where as the prices go up, our folks can afford them.

MOSS: Well, I'd like to think that we could drive wages up in this county as fast as housing prices have gone up, but I think that's unrealistic.

RUPLEY: Let's put that in the plan.

WRISTON: You know, you mentioned a couple of things that I, and I was asking Vaughn, I'm not sure whether we're tackling these now or not, but, you know, market factor was something we heard a lot of testimony on and I think the market factor part is in the Land

Use Element, is it not, the --

LEIN: It's in the first chapter, Chapter 1.

WRISTON: Right. And I don't know if that's like the splits and things, if that's something we're tackling now or we're just going to wait till, you know, later to talk about as we go through the process or how we're going to do that, but we had a fair amount of testimony that both pro and con or if it's even on the table, I don't even know if it's on the table. Is it on the table?

LEE: Yes, as a legislative proceeding you can review those assumptions if you so choose. At the present time we -- the direction under which the plan was designed was no market factor for housing, 50 percent market factor for industrial and 25 percent market factor for commercial. We've heard testimony from the City of Vancouver saying we should do away with all market factors.

WRISTON: What was the -- under the direction as the direction of the Board, the Commissioners' direction, was that --

LEE: Pardon me?

WRISTON: That was the Commissioners' direction when you say --

LEE: Commissioners' direction in selecting a preferred plan was to design it with no market factor for residential, 50 percent for industrial and 25 percent for commercial.

WRISTON: Why did they take it out for residential and not commercial and industrial? Do you know what their rationale was? I didn't hear their discussion on that.

LEE: I think on the employment end of things they wanted the flexibility that the larger land supply would provide, and on the, I think on the housing side of things they felt by adjusting the population rate upward that the needs would be taken care of.

WRISTON: Okay.

LEIN: At this point it appears that we're doing a lot of dialogue that will be sent on to the Board of County Commissioners. Should we continue this way? Is there anything else on Chapter 2, the Housing Element?

WRISTON: Well, there was any -- is that the discussion on the market factor? Is that it, everyone's --

LEIN: Were there comments on the market factor?

WRISTON: Just because that goes back to the Land Use Element.

RUPLEY: I can't find the market factor in Chapter 1.

LEIN: It's on Page 1-21, it's Item 1.1.15, the first bullet.

ORJIAKO: You can find that also on Page 1-21. Maybe I'm repeat --

LEIN: That's the one I said.

ORJIAKO: Okay, I'm repeating you, I'm sorry.

WRISTON: And residential used to be included under the old. I don't know. Was residential 25? In the red line version it has residential as 25 percent for residential and commercial, was it 25?

LEE: The 1994 had a 25 percent residential factor.

LEIN: Any discussion on the Market Factor?

MOSS: Yeah, I think we ought to have one for residential.

LEIN: Okay.

SMITH: Was that a motion?

MOSS: That's a motion.

WRISTON: Okay. It looks like everyone agrees.

LEIN: Carey, do you have a comment?

SMITH: I'd like to hear a little discussion.

BARCA: Will that make the plan more affordable?

MOSS: Make the plan more affordable?

BARCA: Yes.

WRISTON: Housing more affordable.

MOSS: I'm not sure how you measure plan affordability.

BARCA: Well, we have a staff report with a comprehensive plan and that includes a capital facilities element that is designated as the cost of the plan. So my question is: If we grow the market factor on residential will that --

MOSS: You can grow the market factor without changing the population projections at all.

BARCA: But it would boost the necessary boundaries, would it not?

MOSS: How does that -- some, to some degree, yes, and in a minor way that would affect the additional requirement for infrastructure, but not -- it's not directly proportional.

BARCA: No. And I didn't say it was. So it would cost something to add the market factor?

MOSS: Yes.

BARCA: Then I don't think it's a good idea.

MOSS: And it would save something.

BARCA: Such as?

MOSS: Well, it certainly would make the cost of land more affordable.

BARCA: When we had market factor the last round on the comp plan did it make the land more affordable?

MOSS: Well, I think it's --

WRISTON: It's all relative.

MOSS: I think it's all relative, but if you want to look at what land prices have done in anticipation of had a little, that the urban growth boundary is being expanded right now, you're looking at raw land prices that have gone up 50 percent in the last year, I think that's done something to affordability.

BARCA: So you're suggesting, then, if we had a market factor, the cost of land would go down?

MOSS: Certainly. You know that's always the case. It's, you know, the law of supply and demand. You increase the supply, the costs go down; if you raise the demand, costs go up.

BARCA: I think if we go back and look at it from that regional standpoint, though, I think the demand would far outstrip any kind of supply increase we would put together so.

MOSS: Well, that's, you know, that's an argument that's been made. And there are just two schools of thought on that, you know, and the one school is because that Portland has decided to adopt some very restrictive policies and therefore we ought to do the same. I think it's bad planning on their part. I don't feel bound to follow that even though I recognize the paradox that that puts us in in trying to plan here, you know, I don't want to

minimize that. I know that we're the dumping ground, that's not quite the right word, we're the relief valve for the tight land supply in the Portland metro area, I know that. That doesn't necessarily to me, though, translate to a decision that we ought to adopt the same wrong policies that they've adopted. That's something we could spend a lot of time debating, though, and it seems like, you know, the lines are pretty well drawn on that issue, you're either on one side or the other.

SMITH: Is it possible that by holding the line ourselves will tend to push them toward being more liberal when they don't have the safety valve any longer which would be better for the whole metro area?

MOSS: Oh, I doubt that they spend a lot of time --

SMITH: Worrying about us.

MOSS: -- worrying about us.

DELEISSEGUES: In a way it seems like a moot point because if you have the growth, let's say we do something that lessens the cost of raw land and then we have additional growth but yet we can't afford that through the facilities, capital facilities, then we're right back where we are now. There's a quality of life issue too where if you can't afford the capital facilities or you don't pay for them in the right place and you have congestion, then the people that do live here suffer because quality of life would be lessened by some of the congestion and the density of population and maybe some of the facilities that are not in place to be able to handle that growth and when we got to that point, when we looked at the capital facilities plan and it didn't meet the needs of the projected growth, we may have to go back and change it back anyway.

So it looks like what we're really after here is balance somewhere along the line. You know, you follow the planning process and see where that comes out, test it against the affordability, make the adjustments that you have to make. And we've heard some testimony that any growth at all may not be possible with the affordability, so rather than debate this now it seems like we ought to move forward on what we've got, put it to the test of affordability and capital facilities plan, come back and make those matches and then we would know better I would think where we need to make the adjustments. So I'd hate to see a lot of time spent on this debate because I think right now there's no clear answer in my mind to, you know, what's, quote, the right thing to do, unquote.

MOSS: No. And don't take my earlier comments as a belief or an expectation that a great deal of change is going to come out, come about here suddenly, but I do feel considerable frustration with the direction that we're headed here and do want to pass that on for what it's worth. And with that, I'll leave that alone and we can see if we can make some progress here.

SMITH: Oh, I agree, I don't think we've plotted any new ground here.

LEIN: Okay. Can we go on? Chapter 3, Rural and Natural Resource Element. Minor changes in here, better clarify goals and policies. Any comments on Chapter 3?

MOSS: No. Only one, the same one that I've been making for some time and I'll restate it for the same reasons that I restated my earlier comments and that's that I am disappointed that no attention has been given to any of the needed changes in the rural and resource lands, that I believe they've been given short shrift here for some time and there are a great number of landowners who are denied real economic use of their land in the rural area. I think we've ignored that for far too long and I hope that the Commissioners will take that up at the soonest possible -- at their soonest possible convenience. You notice I'm getting shorter, Vaughn.

LEIN: Yeah. I have a question on Table 3.3, Page 3-5. I think there's an addition error, and I'm not sure why, under Meadow Glade. If you add those figures across, you come up with 1,096 and not 1308.

ORJIAKO: Okay, we'll check that. Staff will check that table.

LEIN: Any other comments on rural and natural? If not, let's go on to Chapter 4, Environmental Element. This is a brand-new chapter with supposedly no significant policy?

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

HIGBIE: A slight correction to what you just said, there are significant policies but they haven't changed from the previous plan significantly.

LEIN: I apologize, yes. No policy shifts.

HIGBIE: Correct.

LEIN: Any comments on this chapter?

BARCA: I have a question of staff. The three goals that are related to natural environment within the context of open space and recreation, what tools do we have in place to try and encourage the retention of open space?

LEIN: Ron, what page are you on?

BARCA: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm on 4-1, the second bullet under GMA three goals.

LEIN: Thank you.

ORJIAKO: You said 4-1?

BARCA: Yes.



LEE: I'm not -- by the "three goals" what were you referring to? This goal encourages that -- you mean what tools do we have to retain open space, development of recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife? Is that what you're referring to?

BARCA: Yes.

LEE: Okay. I think as referenced and as presented last week by our Parks Department there was the various projects that Vancouver Clark Parks undertakes in both the regional park system and the urban park system in the Vancouver UGA. In terms of recreational opportunities they are providing a variety of recreational both active, passive, as well as trail systems, including, you know, the components of the countywide bikeway system that we have. The conservation of fish and wildlife habitat is done in part through acquisitions, dedications and a part for attracting grants, partnering up with different folks to try and preserve habitat. We certainly have the habitat ordinance in place to try and deal with protecting habitat when confronted with development permits. And in terms of conservation of fish and wildlife habitat, well, we have wetlands ordinance, habitat ordinance, parks plan, we also have the ongoing work of the ESA Advisory Committee in the ES office which is still developing to respond to ESA issues. So those are some of the activities that go on relating to these goals.

BARCA: So in the context of active measures it's mostly around the aspect of parks and recreation activity and conservation through, what, purchase of like trust fund type activity as far as active measures go, otherwise passive measures are the ordinance protecting these spaces? I'm just trying to paraphrase what you said.

LEE: Yes, those would be the most common tools that we have that are actively used. I mean as part of a subdivision process, if you have significant critical lands on your parcel, you can reallocate densities to the unconstrained parcel to achieve that. I mean that's another tool as well.

BARCA: Okay. I'm just fishing around in my mind right at the moment thinking back where La Center jumped over the river and decided they wanted a piece of commercial property on the opposite side of the river leaving the river itself alone, and I'm trying to think of appropriate measures in which that area could be designated in such a fashion as to not have to take the impacts of urban densities and so forth, but protecting what's there. And I don't have anything specific in mind, I'm just trying to think about the aspect of as different municipalities start to grow and they grow into critical areas, what do we have in place that can afford protection through designation without the aspect of limiting what development is already either permitted or allowed in those particular zones so.

LEE: Okay. And I think you hit most of them. I mean you have the critical area ordinances that do apply through the development permit review process. You do have the ongoing programs of parks and recreation, other entities. There has been -- although it's a little different, though, it could be integrated into an open space system, for example, there's been on and off discussion about potential establishment of wetlands mitigation banks,

things like that. Though we don't have any actively underway, those are things that are periodically looked into to see if they can become a part of this effort. We have plan policies, specifically one that we've called out in I think the current urban holding language, is that between the cities of Camas and Vancouver you maintain an open space corridor which is an existing policy in the current plan.

So there are some things like that. And certainly land use designations themselves do have some bearing. If we have an area that has very significant critical lands on it, it is more likely that we would apply a lesser zoning classification there than one that was not as constrained.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

SMITH: Speaking of mitigation banking, it does cover a lot of the positives, perceived positives of mitigation banking, but there are a lot of real negatives to mitigation banking that should be considered. It drives up the prices of resource agencies that would like to acquire and protect wetlands, it drives up the prices precipitously where developers are actually competing for buying wetlands, in some areas its wetland values from 500 to \$5,000 an acre and up in Snohomish River Basin. And it says here that wetland banking is not a means of reducing the protection when in fact it does more or less give cart blanche to projects on natural wetlands that wouldn't otherwise be considered. And it says right here it's a method of streamlining the permit review for projects, I don't really think that's a plus for wetlands, there is another side of this paragraph that isn't covered very well.

And another thing is really it kind of gets around the issue but what's becoming a much bigger, I may have missed it somewhere, a much bigger problem is invasive species and habitats and it does say, it does mention here improve habitats, but invasive species is becoming a much larger piece of that action where PUD is spending a lot of its time just in that venue and it's possible that maybe it deserves a paragraph of its own in here. For instance, the Corps of Engineers proposed a \$2.6 million project to remove reed canary grass from 100 acres of Salmon Creek Park and the County was considering it for a while, so it's a fairly large issue.

MOSS: Did I hear a complaint there earlier about the rising cost of land?

SMITH: Yeah.

BARCA: The rising cost of wetlands so we should actually designate more wetlands to drive down the price I believe.

SMITH: Make them low cost housing area in there.

MOSS: I think we've done everything that we can to help you, Carey.

SMITH: I appreciate it.

RUPLEY: I have a question, probably a relationship question on Page 4-12, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. In your last paragraph it says that the Gorge Commission staff are in the process of updating gorge management plan which may result in changes for ordinance. Do you have any forecast of what you might see from them? Have you had any discussion with them that that might change within here?

LEE: Sandra has been involved with discussions with the Gorge Commission.

TOWNE: Sandra Towne, Clark County. They still have a ways to go and they're discussing a lot of things and we -- I, just very clearly I don't think we know the extent that might make some changes in our code at this time. One good -- one thing is that we have a very small portion of the Gorge in Clark County and so it would only be that portion that would be -- any kind of changes to it. They're looking at just some, give you an idea, they're looking at -- right now they're in the middle of the review process and public process to see whether changing forest use to ag use and how could that happen and what portion of the forest use might go to ag use, so they're looking at sharing the two resource uses and how they would do that. There aren't any big changes that would change zoning like the higher density and that sort of thing.

RUPLEY: So you don't see any major impact in terms of what they might do either financially or in terms of the things we're looking at?

TOWNE: I don't at this time. I don't at this time, but it's not over yet and I, but I, no, I don't think there will be. They're revisiting view shed areas and they're trying to make everything more user friendly. So actually they're going the other direction, they're trying to make a lot of the regulation -- there's been complaints that it's difficult to interpret and so they're going in and trying to clean that up and make it much easier for interpretation and for landowners to understand what is required, that's a lot of the update. Does that help?

RUPLEY: Okay. Yes, thank you. My other question relates to Page 4-13 on Air Resources and Air Quality on Page 4-14. How do you work with the State agency in terms of air quality issues and the monitoring levels? I know you have the Southwest Washington Clean Air Agency, but I think what I found they don't have a lot of local authority in terms of some specific businesses.

LEE: Realistically I think the most significant effect is through the regional transportation coordination that has gone since the mobile source emissions is a large contributor. And for example the regional transportation system has to be -- as it goes through its regular updates has to be tested against what the air quality attainment and maintenance standards are, so that is the primary interface where we have. And, frankly, with the 1.83 percent growth rate that we're facing, we might be rubbing up against some of those air quality limitations. At least that's the preliminary indication we received from the RTC.

RUPLEY: Okay. So most of what you're dealing with in here is going to be in terms of transportation?

LEE: Yes.

RUPLEY: Okay, thank you.

SMITH: Under "greenway systems" it identifies open space categories in the greenway systems. One of those is river systems and associated floodplains. One of those highlighted is the Lacamas Creek Floodplain, we have a request from the city of Vancouver that is asking for several hundred acres of floodplain critical habitat and I identified floodway and critical habitat in Category I critical areas to come within the city boundary when what they're really after is an opportunity to create more commercial or residential land along the one up above the 192nd corridor and along 162. I think they got a little over zealous and I think they agreed to some degree on where they drew their circles here and they have nearly half of that area that they wanted put into the UGA is under literally under water for two or three months of the year and I'd hope we can take another look at that when we get there because it certainly doesn't go along with the opportunity to create green spaces.

A matter of fact, this area has been identified by the group that's putting together the new bond for more green spaces and it was identified, there are several tiers for those areas identified and this was identified for Tier 1, full habitat and greenways, which are both their criterion they're using, so I hope we could take a good look at this when we're considering the ordinance here.

BARCA: Can we get that better identified for the record?

SMITH: Here's a Map 2 here and this shows, I don't know if we can project this, I think part of their request is, yeah, I believe some of part of their request is well warranted.

DUST: This area up in here?

SMITH: That's right. And this is 162nd, this is Fourth Plain that comes right through here, they've already decided they didn't need this and this area in here is all critical habitat and identified as "floodway" which is should be protected, the rest of this is all going in as -- this I think they're asking a site-specific plan for commercial here, this is all going to subdivision all the way through here. So this is logical to go into the plan, but this area --

BARCA: Carey.

SMITH: Yes.

BARCA: Would you just put pink around that boundary and then give it to Evan so.

SMITH: There is ongoing, I think I've got a little written --

LEE: There's a letter in the packet we gave you tonight. There is a letter from Vancouver with that map on it.

BARCA: Use their laser pointer there.

SMITH: I guess you can see it there. And there are some practices the families there, the Bakkers and others, are currently partaking in recreational things that would no longer be allowed if it went into the city. This is Fourth Plain going across, this is 162nd, I think we have a site-specific, several site-specific sites here. One of them is commercial in this corner and this whole area is all floodplain, it's all critical habitat, and I literally kayak through this whole area. This site right here, the owner of this site is the same owner as that site, one is outside the deal and this is supposed to be within the city urban use plan. So that's more site-specific than we intended to be in this section, but I'm sorry.

RUPLEY: What kind of kayak do you have?

SMITH: A cheap one. I was afraid I might not be at the meeting when we were discussing that so I thought I'd shoot my wad today.

LEIN: Any other comments on the Environmental Element?

WRISTON: Yeah. As long as everyone's promoting their deal, why is mining always left out as a natural resource industry? Something to, something to consider. We have --

LEE: It's actually not.

WRISTON: -- timber, agriculture and fisheries, isn't mining natural resource based?

LEE: Yes, it is. If you, I believe if you go to the Rural and Natural Resource Element there's --

WRISTON: I know it's in there. I mean I'm not, (inaudible) maintenance and enhancement of, you know. Anyway, I just thought I'd --

LEE: Would you like us to designate a quarry as a wetland?

WRISTON: And then under "air sources" we got rock quarries as the very first point source as Jada points out, but that's okay.

RUPLEY: And I saw that and I would like to add paper mills to lumber mills in there so that we know they're a point source of pollution from where I live anyway.

WRISTON: And we don't put out VOCs or NOx actually I don't think. So just asked, anyway.

LEIN: Anything you want to bring up here, Lonnie?

WRISTON: Yeah, he had his chapter in here.

DELEISSEGUES: Vaughn, don't go there.

RUPLEY: He promised to be quiet.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Can we move on to the Transportation Element, please. This could take a while or it could go right through.

RUPLEY: What?

LEIN: The comments.

WRISTON: Depending on what you have to say. Evan's back.

LEE: He'd certainly be more than willing if you had some questions.

DUST: No, suddenly I've lost my voice.

RUPLEY: And there's nothing wrong with that.

LEIN: Can you help me understand, do we address reducing level-of-service here as a possibility?

LOWRY: (Rich Lowry nods head affirmatively.)

LEIN: Thank you, Rich.

MOSS: What was the answer to your question?

LEIN: Yes, we do as a policy. My concern is being able to work through the capital facilities plan may mean that part of that infers that we will have to reduce the level-of-service in the areas of roads.

MOSS: Well, if you're looking for comments on that, I think on Page 5-21 there's a statement in that middle paragraph that certainly can't be argued with, and that's that "the roadway level-of-service standard must reflect a reasonable balance between the amount of improvements the County and its cities can afford and the amount of congestion the public can tolerate," I think that's the balance that we've got to search for here. You know, it's pretty obvious that we're not all -- we're not going to have all the money that we need. It's also pretty obvious that we can't, that we can't accept congestion that borders on gridlock, so we've just got to find that balance. Good luck.

BARCA: Do we have some examples of where we've found that balance so far?

RUPLEY: How about one example.

LOWRY: I will step in here. Just, Rich Lowry again, historically that what the County has done with level-of-service is try to match what exists today. And for example, the corridor speeds that we have under the current concurrency system are not based on the classification of the road you're on, they're simply based upon what the historic performance of those roads are. The Board has expressed an interest in trying to go to a corridor speed analysis that's more programmatically based, that's based not simply on historic experience but what makes sense depending upon what the function and classification of the road is. One consequence of going to that sort of a system would be that we would be able to focus investment not simply because historic speeds were degrading, but rather because we were getting to that intolerable congestion level so. I mean I think this whole process is going to be a very complex one involving revisiting level-of-service analysis, revisiting our six year project list, revisiting our financial projections and it all is interrelated and it's going to have to be done as part of one project, which is what we did when we came up with the current affordable CFP.

BARCA: Well, I certainly believe that we've missed some opportunities in the past concerning the aspect of level-of-service. On some of our significant roadways we choose to put a lot of intersections or accesses on those major thoroughfares that creates a lot of problems as far as flow of traffic goes, the design concepts have to be I believe a much more disciplined to help in the aspect of flow. I believe early in my time spent on this Commission we dealt with level-of-service and we made some recommendations towards the aspect of timing the lights where traffic on the 503 would be affected in one direction and then going in the other direction the timing would have to change. I don't believe that I really saw any changes coming out of County staff as far as developments continued along the 503, whether they got access to that highway or not or whether there was other roads put in place, whether or not the timing of lights ever became something that was done.

LEE: Well, I can certainly say that access management is something that we have a lot coming towards us largely because of current policies of the State Department of Transportation. They are very concerned about access management along the State highway corridors and what that forces us to do if they are to continue the policy of limiting the access, which does make sense from a transportation movement standpoint, is that we then have to address how the surrounding land uses can funnel to a limited number of access points so you maintain the safe travel on the highway system. So we deal with that we have two, at least two, circulation plans that we are dealing with now that have come about because of that very situation.

BARCA: Okay. And I believe that the aspect of utilization of frontage roads and funnel points for commercial development is going to become more important for us to look at and review and should be a significant part of the review process specifically for this region as we get into more and more roads that are starting to drop down on the level-of-service. There was something in the final EIS concerning the aspect of what it was going to cost just to try and keep the roads at Level D Service and I think that was -- I can't really quote what it was now, but it was quite prohibitive from what we had available in funds.

So we already know that there are certain segments of the roads over the comp plan that are going to have to degrade down to a Level E, F, type and anything that we can do in that regard I think we need to put that right up front that this is the reason why it has to be this way and this is why we're doing these things so people understand that this is one of the few mitigations that we have available to us.

LEIN: Any other comments on the Transportation Element?

RUPLEY: I have a question, it's on Page 5-27. Under System Development 5.1.1 it talks about capital facilities plans, concurrency strategies and impact fee programs should be jointly undertaken with the city and reviewed. This is just my question, do you review these with the Cities and come to a --

DUST: We have an interlocal agreement with the City of Vancouver that applies to the Vancouver urban growth area that covers the transportation impact fee program explicitly. Obviously since the impact fee program relies upon the capital facilities plan, there is some level of coordination that is imposed by that interlocal agreement. Beyond that, unlike land use where the County is essentially the regional authority under Growth Management Act, the regional authority for transportation coordination is reserved to a constructive estate which is the Regional Transportation Planning Organization which is identified there as the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council. The level of coordination with RTC has certainly been enhanced now that we're in the new public services center. Their staff is on the same floor with City Transportation and County Public Works Transportation and then we're a short flight of stairs below them.

RUPLEY: I think that's wonderful, but you just talked about the City of Vancouver, let's take what do you do to coordinate with Battle Ground for example, especially when they're looking at their big expansion?

DUST: During the process I personally attended meetings with almost all City staff in each of the UGAs to go over where the County was on capital facilities planning for the transportation system to advise them of the direction that I felt I had received from senior staff and the Board and to identify if there were any potential conflicts. Sometimes that coordination has been very effective and in other cases it hasn't been.

RUPLEY: Because if I read the way 5.1.1 reads, it sounds like there's agreement between the County and the various Cities and then the RTC is the one that does oversight, but I don't think that's what you're saying to me, Evan, is that --

DUST: I think there's agreement between the Cities and the Counties that to the extent we can coordinate transportation capital facilities, we do so. A great deal of that coordination happens with our attendance and City representative attendance at the advisory committee to the RTC Board which is the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee or RTAC. So we go through a great deal of these issues for the past at least three to four months on the RTAC monthly agenda. Either myself or Pat Lee have briefed that body on the status of the comprehensive plan work and where we're heading on capital facilities. So we're doing



almost everything we can to coordinate short of, you know, inventing a whole bunch of money so that we can build some roads in other people's jurisdiction.

RUPLEY: And that's kind of, I'm going to refer to the October 16th letter, so you may choose to disagree on what you consider priorities?

DUST: Correct.

RUPLEY: Okay.

LEIN: Anything else on transportation?

DELEISSEGUES: No. It just seems to me that the policies that we have in place that transportation improvements are going to continue to occur in the urban areas because that's where the growth is and that's where the, you know, the concurrency requirements are going to be at the expense of the rural area which I don't think is well served now by County roads and I think it's only going to get worse. I think Battle Ground made a pretty good presentation when they pointed out that the welfare of the county is going to eventually rely on a good transportation system that connects all of the communities with each other and it doesn't seem that that's not only not going to happen, but maybe the existing road system won't be in as good a condition as it is now to serve the traffic that is expanding by leaps and bounds.

And an example of that is Ward Road and 182nd. When the County opened the Padden Parkway it was a wonderful east/west corridor, but it dumped all the traffic out on Ward Road and rather than the traffic proceeding to Battle Ground on a State four lane road which has more and more traffic signals and is getting more and more congested, you put all that traffic on really a road that's not at all designed or capable of handling the amount of traffic that it has. And I know that the County has got plans to supposedly improve Ward Road, but the improvements that they've got planned is not going to make the difference that's going to be needed as a result of the traffic that's being added to it by Padden. I just think that there's got to be a comprehensive traffic analysis and planning in the county rather than some of the ones that are listed.

And the only other comment I would have is the traffic signal coordination. It looks good in the paper that traffic coordination and signalization is going to be improved on a number of streets, but as long as I've been driving in Clark County, which maybe hadn't been all that long but ten years or so, I have seen absolutely no improvement in traffic signal coordination and it seems to me rather than benefiting the flow of traffic, it's actually causing a great deal of congestion backing up the traffic at the intersections and particularly during long waits when there's absolutely no cross-traffic. There's a lot of improvement that could be made there for very little money that would improve vastly the commute times and some of the level-of-service things that we're talking about that wouldn't cost a whole lot of money to do that, just some effort.

LEIN: Anything else on transportation? If not, I'd like to take a brief break for Ms. Holley,

she's been working for about two hours straight, and then we can come back and determine how long we want to continue this this evening. So let's take a little break.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: I'd like to reconvene the hearing. We completed the Transportation Element. What I'd like to do is make a suggestion on how to complete tonight's meeting. Before I do that, Jeff, you had one issue you wanted to bring up?

WRISTON: Yeah, in the environmental area. And I apologize I didn't bring it up earlier because I was looking to see if I could find it or find out what was going on, but there is -- on Page 4-19 I was questioning there's a brand-new goal and then an older policy, a policy that's existed, I don't know if you guys are with me, on 4-19 the goal on the conducting of mineral operations and then the policy before below it 4.7 and 4.7.1, that policy already exists in the Natural Resource Element where there's a whole section on mineral lands and mineral extraction, exists as 3.5.9. So I just talked to staff and what I suggest is that we just leave it in under mineral lands and the natural resource section since that's where mineral lands are. So leave it as 3.5.9. And the goal is -- I mean there's supposed to be no new major policy shifts or anything and that's a whole new goal they've put into the, that's been put into the -- I don't know if there are other new goals, but that's a new goal that's been put into the comprehensive plan. I think all of it is sufficiently covered elsewhere though.

LEIN: So your recommendation is to eliminate that goal in 4.7 and renumber the remaining policies?

WRISTON: Yeah. I mean, because once again I mean nowhere else in the environmental element that I could see is a specific use singled out. I don't see it anyway.

BARCA: Isn't it relevant specifically with the aspect of salmonoid recovery?

WRISTON: Well, I mean I know, but there's hundreds of things that are relevant to the specific aspect of salmonoid recovery. I don't think mining is the one thing to, you know, I mean I don't know. I mean we can talk about it, but it certainly is a shift in policies or goals that wasn't, you know, that the whole idea was that we were taking elements that existed and putting them into a new chapter and I don't know, there are a lot of uses that are relevant to the protection of salmonoid.

LEE: From staff's perspective it's redundant to have the policy twice and it's okay with us to keep it as 3.5.9. I don't think the intent as Jeff, as Jeff has characterized it, it really wasn't the intent to change the policy I think. We in putting together the environmental chapter we had to consolidate a bunch of policies from several different chapters so the writing style was a little different and that's why you have the Goal statements with the Policies under it. So functionally it is covered because the policy already exists in the area where mineral resources are discussed so we think it's okay there.

WRISTON: It's kind of redundant to have a goal along those lines anyway given the amount of regulation that we're under. I mean it's you can illegally conduct mining operations that don't meet water quality or exceed water quality standards, but I mean as a stated goal the amount of regulation we're under I'm not sure that it really needs to be stated. But if it's stated here, then what about conducting other activities within the urban growth boundary and as they relate to maybe there should be just one goal as it relates to protection of water quality, critical areas and salmonoid recovery. Are you following me?

MOSS: Yeah.

WRISTON: It seems a little --

MOSS: Yeah, I agree it's probably not appropriate to single out --

WRISTON: Single out one use. I mean but in the, you know, within the 3.5.9 where that use is talked about in the Natural Resource Element where that use is talked about in great detail and I don't mind, I mean that goal can be put in there as well, I mean it really doesn't add much, it's kind of like duh.

ORJIAKO: It doesn't, but we recognize your concern and we will concur with Pat.

LEIN: Okay. What I'd like to suggest is continuing on with the capital facilities and park and economic development right now. What I'd like to do is discuss whether there are any site-specific pieces that we would want staff to look at in any of the areas. We had a discussion at the last meeting about whether there were or not. We didn't come to complete agreement as to whether there were individual parcels that we felt should be looked at by staff and if we're going to do that, we'd like to give them an idea of what those parcels are, because if it's in the UGA it will require a hearing and a posting in terms of indication of hearing and I believe SEPA.

LEE: Yes.

TOWNE: May I?

LEIN: Sandra.

TOWNE: Thank you. Sandra Towne. Right away I would like to mention before you start maybe considering other sites, the Presbyterian of the Cascades who Dan George their representative spoke this evening testified, the County and the staff want to recommend that that piece be considered to go forward to the Board this year. It is a, right now it's mixed use comprehensive plan with an ML zoning and because of the circumstance, the legal circumstance of it being agricultural and then being changed to ML so they no longer could build a church there, it's not allowed. Because of the circumstances around their properties, as Dan George spoke of that, we think that that is one of them that makes sense to go forward this year and to make changes to it. It does not require a comp plan change so we would go through the notice, it would be like a docket and we would do a

docket on it.

LEIN: So it's a rezone?

TOWNE: As a rezone, correct.

LEIN: So we don't need to act on it?

TOWNE: That's correct.

LEIN: So that just took that site-specific away from us?

TOWNE: That took it away.

LEIN: Thank you.

TOWNE: Did I make that clear?

LEIN: Any others that you would recommend?

TOWNE: Just to take away?

LEIN: We got a little bit of time left here.

TOWNE: Not at this time, no.

LEIN: Okay. Members of the Commission, any site-specific or discussion on this? Mr. Moss.

MOSS: Okay. All of them. I feel like we've got a problem there, that we have a problem here that I feel like we need to address and that's that I think we've set some expectations in this process that we're maybe about to violate. I don't think that that's a good precedent here. I'm concerned about the credibility of government here in the way that we're handling this exercise. And I realize the problems that are inherent with this either way. I understand that if we elect to consider all of these site-specific requests that that's going to get to be a very tedious, laborious process and one that I really don't want to volunteer for. And I also understand that there are specific notice requirements that have to be made if we're going to consider many of these because they really don't relate to expansion of the urban growth boundary and aren't covered in the EIS, that's the environmental document that's been done here.

On the other hand, for the past two or three years landowners have been if not actively encouraged at least told that their request would be considered in some form in this process that's ongoing. We stopped the annual review process so that they didn't have that vehicle to use to make this kind of request so they've had no other opportunity. We've set some expectations I think that there would be fair consideration given to each one of

these requests. The requests have become very numerous, there are nearly 300 of those, it may exceed 300 this time, so it isn't, you know, it is a big job I think to handle those in any fashion.

The problem that I have with this is that we've provided the forum, we've provided encouragement, and we've had people come down and testify before this Planning Commission at some expense to them either emotionally, it's a tough job to come out in a public forum like this and do that, or financially to hire somebody else to have done that for them and many, many of these folks have hired professional help to present their cases. I feel like we've got some obligation to those folks to handle their requests in a fair and equitable manner and I'm very concerned that we might dismiss a great number of these out of hand. Now it's been suggested that we not consider any of those that don't relate to the urban growth boundary expansions. We can do that but there's going to be a considerable loss of credibility and I think it's something that all of us ought to be concerned about. I think we've boxed ourselves into a corner here with what we've done and the way that we've allowed the process to unfold and I'm just not comfortable at all telling any of these people that the answer is no, that we're just not going to consider them and I'd like to hear from some of the other Commissioners about what your reaction is to that.

SMITH: I reluctantly agree with you to some degree. We heard one tonight where the two proponents were 87 and 90-years-old and the change in zoning made all the sense in the world, are we going to make them wait until they're 90 and see if they make it to 90 and 95 I guess, I think it is a matter of credibility. But what I have to ask staff is if we go through if not all a lot of these site-specific requests are the County Commissioners going to give them the same amount of time? I hate to spend weeks and weeks going through these things, then have the County Commissioners make a decision that blocks of these weren't, wouldn't be considered?

LEE: Well, let me make a couple of comments first. Maybe to fully explain the various corners of the box that we are in I don't think that it is the expectations should be quite as high as maybe they really are. We did -- in 2000 and 2001 we did not have an annual review process because at that time we were on schedule to complete the comp plan process in 2001. When it became apparent that we were going to address head on the urban growth boundary question and as a result had to do the EIS which extended the schedule to current time frame that we're in from 2001, at that time the Commissioners did open up the annual review process one year and we estimate that at least a majority of the site-specific requests that are currently on the spreadsheets that you've seen we sent letters out to each one of them saying the annual review process is open.

At the same time, as staff we felt it was important to give them some sense of whether or not based on the existing comp plan policies we as staff could recommend in favor or not in favor of the change that they were requesting and there were many that the staff recommendation based on, you know, the typical policy review that we would do as an annual review process would have been and not to approve the change. So with that information some of the people that received those letters, a small number, did actually file annual review applications but not all and the majority did not. Again, we're still in the

process so it's kind of hard to know where the process is going to come out in terms of policies. In terms of the proposed plan, the proposed comp plan text, there's not a lot of dramatic change in the policy direction that we had received.

And so in response directly to Carey's question I would say, you know, I cannot speak for the Board, but I would say that they would certainly want us to at least take all of the list of potential dockets back to them and see if they wanted to proceed or would we just be reinforcing what may very well be a negative perception that if the Planning Commission spends a lot of time, the Board is not going to reconsider, it would just had drawn out the pain a bit longer. So that is kind of where we are. I think it provides a little more background on the effort, at least we tried to make -- to give them an option sooner, but the fact is that, you know, we still have a long list of folks that are looking and many of them have testified before you over this period.

WRISTON: I don't think that should -- I mean I think that's great, I mean I think you should, but that shouldn't influence whether we think we should review these or not. If we think we should review these and you take it to the Commissioners and the Commissioners say no, so be it.

LOWRY: Right. And I think, Rich Lowry, and I think my recommendation is that you make a -- that you come up with a recommendation and that that recommendation not wait for you, for the rest of the deliberations to go to the Commissioners, but that that be taken to the Commissioners immediately. So your recommendation in terms of what you ought to now be doing with the site-specifics so we can get that to the Commissioners and the Commissioners can make a decision early on.

WRISTON: That's fine with me. I just, I mean I, yeah, you know, I think it square, I think it squarely lies in their hands. I mean we're -- well, I don't know. I mean I'm willing to, we're going to hear them one way or another. I mean maybe some are going to drop out which would be unfortunate if they still wanted to do it but they just get fed up with the process, but otherwise they're going to come at us. Maybe they'll come at us in bits and pieces, but they're going to, we're going to hear them through docket, you know, but it's just or, you know, the annual reviews and dockets and things like that. But so, I mean, I'm not going to shy away from them nor do I want to pull out my calendar and start looking into 2004 but --

MOSS: No. And I don't think that anybody on this Planning Commission wants to spend a great deal of time working on all of these site-specific requests only to find out that the Commissioners aren't willing to rule on them. So I would like to have them make that decision early one way or the other.

WRISTON: Yeah, if -- and we haven't heard from all of the Commissioners.

MOSS: No, we haven't.

LEIN: Well, one of the questions I have, there's years associated with the application if I'm not mistaken, some of them are 2003, some are 2002, 2001, in my mind if it's necessarily a

brand-new one I'm not probably as agreeable to want to look at those right now as opposed to those that might be two, three years old. I mean they're brand-new into the system and the system can be set up so that perhaps they can be monitored next year or the year following with an annual review process. But I'm not sure that I want to get into suggesting to the Board that we have to go through -- that we should go through every one of those when some of them are brand-new myself.

WRISTON: What is the -- are most of them brand-new?

LEE: What do you consider -- I think from the time we sent out the letter informing them that the annual review process was again open, we probably have covered more than half of the requests who received that letter. And as I said, a very small number actually did pursue the annual review, recognizing that obviously the annual review has an application fee with it which can be intimidating to some folks.

WRISTON: But if we looked at Vaughn, what Vaughn's saying, I mean you're saying this year probably, right, or what do you consider --

LEIN: Something like that. I mean we've got a lot of new ones this year that --

WRISTON: How many of them are 2001, '02?

LEIN: -- may not have the same kind of expectation.

LEE: Well, certainly all the ones probably identified with a 2003 label would be after that annual review option had been foreclosed, but I think probably most of them before then might have been addressed. I'd have to check the actual time that we sent out the letter.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I share Lonnie's concern and I sure think we need to spend some time deliberating on whether or not we need to spend the time and how much time we need to spend I guess on it. But I think we do need to address the issue and I would like to see it rather than Vaughn's suggestion looking at it as area, some of them are inside the urban growth boundaries, some of them are just outside or adjacent to the boundary line, some of them are scattered throughout the county, the rural to rural request for changes, if we could come up with some categories and classifications and look at it from a countywide perspective and see what makes sense. If there's a bunch of them that makes sense and some of those are 2003, 2002 and 2001 but they're in the same general category and in an area of the county that we agree ought to be adjusted, expanded, contracted or whatever, the ones that fall within our agreement would be approved and the ones that fall outside of that we would not regardless of the date that they were submitted. Because I can just see somebody that's just submitted one surrounded by three or four other property owners that submitted it in 2001 and then it would be unequal and unfair treatment to not consider the one that just sent it in in 2003.

LEE: Reminding that, you know, of the 268 or so that we had on the spreadsheet, 109 or so, or actually a little more than that if you are considering, but at least, you know, I think

109 or so are hung up in that urban growth boundary question so are clearly part of these deliberations, it's the others that are either separated from that decision by being entirely within existing urban growth boundaries and away from that fringe issue or in the rural area that are the ones that cause the challenges in terms of noticing and a separate hearing.

LEIN: Well, I think we heard, also talking about the rural ones this evening, that once we start bringing the rural in it's a whole new ball game, we need to talk about resource lands, et cetera, so to me site-specific is going to be very difficult to talk about in the rural area without a major work program for the entire rural area.

BARCA: So that being said --

LEIN: We pull those out.

BARCA: -- if we're going to get any kind of clarification from the Board of County Commissioners, I think then it would be site-specific outside of any urban growth boundary expansion in the rural lands to find out if we spend the time to open that up, the level of involvement that staff is going to have to do to present the argument on each one of those cases and have us review that, that specifically where I'm interested in knowing that that time isn't going to be wasted because that's staff's time, that's our time, on an issue that was outside of the aspect of where the urban growth boundary goes from here. I think if it's inside the urban growth boundary or if it's adjacent to it, I think we're going to have to touch it without regard to what year it was put on the table, but the ones that are outside, any question whether they're going to be impacted by urban growth boundary, then I would like to get a clarification whether a lot of resources would be expended only to have the Board of County Commissioners decide that it wasn't on the table really and that time would be wasted and the people would have as was said perhaps additional false expectations built because we spend our time debating it, make a recommendation, only to have it dropped at that point in time.

WRISTON: Do we need to give the Commissioners that we think we should or should not or are we just going to ask for a clarification that -- I mean I think they've already told staff that they don't want to do it, but; right? You're looking at me blank.

LEE: I think in terms of the many changes from resource designations to other rural designations, yes, I think we've heard that at least up to now none of the Commissioners are interested in dealing with those.

LEIN: How about within the UGA?

LEE: I think there is divided opinion. I think the constraint there is the timing, what it would take to get through those. I mean one cut that could be made, I don't know what the number was, but we had sent letters out to everybody saying you are or are not in. You know, if people made the effort to send in written testimony or testify here, maybe that gives them an opportunity to continue; if they chose not to, maybe that's a cut point that you could consider.



LEIN: Well, I guess then it's been made clear to staff that the Commissioners, County Commissioners, don't want to look at the rural question. So our question would be to the Board is do they want to look at those areas within the UGA or would we be wasting our time to look at site-specific cases in there. Is that pretty much it or do you have other direction?

LEE: No, that is basically I think the -- as I said, a lot of them are hung up in the urban growth boundary location decision and will be addressed through this process and clearly get full consideration, so really the challenges are the ones inside the urban growth boundary.

MOSS: I'm still a little bothered by this process or the outcome or the message that we're sending here and that's that what message do we send back to these people. Are we sending them the message that, let's take the rural ones for example, if we got a, if we've got somebody that's applied through this process for a change, what are they going to get back, something that says that their request has been considered and the ruling was negative or are we going to send something back that says what's factual and that's that your request was not considered?

LEIN: I think that would be something that the Board would have to deal with.

LEE: Well, I think what's factual is that the Board has not reconsidered the existing policies regarding the rural area and therefore are not making any changes to the rural area.

MOSS: But what's also factual is that was not explained to these people at the time that they made those requests.

LEE: At the time those requests were made the Board had not made those decisions so they pointed to the ongoing process as an opportunity to get that on the table.

MOSS: I guess my point is I believe that these folks having gone through this trouble, and many of them having gone through considerable expense, need an explanation of how their request was handled and that shouldn't come back to them as, yeah, it was considered and it was voted down I mean or an implication that that was it, I would rather have them get an honest answer that says it wasn't considered.

DELEISSEGUES: It was tabled.

MOSS: If that's going to be the policy decision that we're going to reject everybody inside the urban growth boundary and outside the urban growth boundary and only consider those that are on the fringes, then that's what needs to go back to those folks and I think it would be my recommendation that some explanation as to how that happened would be a whole lot more palatable for people to get.

LOWRY: Actually, Rich Lowry again, I think that that not only is accurate but really does

need to be actually in the ultimate ordinance that's adopted perhaps as a recital so there isn't some implication if one of these people wants to make application for an annual review that their (inaudible) --

MOSS: That they're prejudiced because we already made a decision to turn them down.

LOWRY: So I would envision including a recital in the ultimate ordinance indicating that the site-specifics that weren't related to boundary movement were not considered.

WRISTON: Well, I don't know. I don't know what we have to pass or what we want the Board might to do, but from my standpoint even for at least a few of the Commissioners say that they feel, including myself, some obligation to hear all the site-specific requests so I would like to hear the Board reaffirm their position that they don't want us to hear those rural requests or they don't want us to hear those urban, you know, those requests inside the urban growth boundary. I mean I don't want to, I will go through those requests and, you know, I mean we'll, I mean I think probably all of us would if that's what, you know, I mean I'm not sure where everyone still stands on it, but I'd like to hear them reaffirm that they don't want us to do that, especially given all the testimony that we've had, you know, the pages and pages of testimony that, you know, notes and things that we have. So that would be my --

LEIN: Do you think there's an opportunity to get the Board before our next hearing on Monday to get some direction or not?

LEE: Before Monday would be difficult, before next Thursday is very doable, we do have a work session scheduled with them on Wednesday.

WRISTON: Well, where is everyone I mean?

LEIN: How do the rest of you feel? Do you want additional direction from the Board --

RUPLEY: Yes.

LEIN: -- on all the rural as well as the site-specific within the UGA?

SMITH: Yeah, that's what I said.

RUPLEY: Yes.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I think Ron made a good point when he pointed out that if we don't have that direction we could certainly spin a lot of wheels, so it would be very helpful if we did have some clear direction on how they wanted us to proceed with this. But I do, I share Lonnie's concern too that we owe I think at least some consideration to the people that put an awful lot of time and effort, and a lot of them put a lot of money, into their presentations. And we've got the package in front of us. What are we going to do if we don't hear them? Are we going to put this into some data bank and then use the same

data again or are they going to have to go through another process of having a professional consultant prepare a package at another tremendous expense and come in again? I mean if we don't do it, how are we going to handle it?

LEIN: Well, I think we can certainly recommend to the Board that they consider putting as many as possible on the docket. We know that they won't put all of them on there, they don't expand the docket, that's a free situation, and then I guess also recommend opening the annual review process which will cost money to get into.

RUPLEY: And maybe the recommendations have all of those in there that we do this many, they'll do this many on the dockets, and then the annual review process for recommendations so that we at least address all of these requests in some way, shape or form.

LEIN: Okay.

SMITH: That the scrutiny that each one of these receives would be really different. I mean the docket type items the staff puts together a nice package, the pros and the cons and their recommendation, and if we're going to do them just out of hand saying, well, how about Number 4 or 15, how do you feel about that one and there's just so much parity there.

LEE: Well, I think you'll have -- with these you have a complication and the unpredictability of the required notification that our legal counsel has advised us is needed for those that are, you know, not associated with urban growth boundary decision. So you have to notify the surrounding property owners, post the site, et cetera, and it is very difficult for us to predict at this time how controversial any one of these may be.

DELEISSEGUES: That's true.

LEIN: Okay. Do you need any more direction in order to help us learn some more things from the Board?

LEE: Let me -- I will be looking to next week's work session with the Board which would not be in time for your Monday hearing, but we would have an answer in time for the Thursday. We could review it in a work session what their decision was in terms of how to address the site-specific requests that we've been talking about.

WRISTON: In that direction from the Board I think it would be helpful for us or soothing for us or something or at least something that we can say on the record of how if they choose not to do certain ones, the rural ones or any of them, what we're going to do to get back to them or how we're going to -- I know besides just how we address them and the wording itself, but I think we at least owe some form of a letter or something I would think, something to tell them.

LEE: Well, I don't disagree. We've notified them all wherever they were in regard to the

proposed plan by letter, I'd certainly do the same thing after a decision was made.

WRISTON: Right.

MOSS: Okay.

LEIN: Anything else on this issue? Okay. In light of the time of the evening I would suggest that we move the from Chapter 6 on to Monday night's agenda. Monday night will be here. Or excuse me, at the Hearing Room at the Board of County Commissioners at the Admin Building starting at 6:30. No workshop or not?

LEE: Is there a need for a workshop do you think?

ORJIAKO: I don't think so.

LEIN: We have a workshop on Thursday for --

LEE: But actually the Thursday work session next week would be regarding the Home Occupations Ordinance which will be coming back to you soon.

WRISTON: Oh, man. That's Thursday?

LEE: Yes, the work session is Thursday, the 6th, the actual hearing is the 20th.

LEIN: The 20th. Now do we have a hearing the evening of the 6th or is that just a workshop?

LEE: We are suggesting that you have a hearing.

LEIN: Continued deliberations.

LEE: Continued deliberations, yes.

LEIN: Okay. And that would be here at City Hall?

LEE: Yes, I believe that's correct.

RUPLEY: Vaughn.

MOSS: Would it be wise to consider continuing that hearing on the Home Occupation Ordinance or are we going to be, are we going to be trying to break from all this and insert that in the middle?

LEE: I'm hoping you will have made your recommendation by that time.

MOSS: You dreamer.

LEE: That is certainly something that you can consider, yes, if you wish to do that.

RUPLEY: Rich Lowry.

LOWRY: We've done quite a bit of work on the home occupation and I think we'll -- the work session will be useful because what we should be able to present to you is sort of a decision tree to hear all the options that are available to you, treat existing different than new or not, and how to treat them. So I think what we're probably going to be asking from the Planning Commission not so much to craft the final ordinance but to make recommendations on that decision tree and so that could be make your hearing or your deliberations on that a lot smoother and faster than it otherwise would be.

MOSS: Okay, that would be helpful.

RUPLEY: It might be a welcome diversion. What else do you think we'll get to on Monday in terms of finishing this up? What next?

LEIN: On Monday, the Text Amendments.

BARCA: Well, we only got to Chapter 6.

LEIN: Yeah, we have Chapter 6, 7, 9, 12 and then the Text Amendments if we have any time --

LEE: Code Changes.

LEIN: -- we could go into Code Changes.

BARCA: So we flew right through that part. Is the decision tree on the home occupation already prepared and available?

LOWRY: It's prepared in draft form. You're suggesting you'd like to get an early look-see at it?

BARCA: Yes.

LOWRY: I think the last time I saw it we did some additional edits, I don't know whether those have been included, but we can check with Gordy.

LEE: We can check and see where it stands.

BARCA: Okay.

LEIN: Anything else in terms of old business or new business? Any comments from staff?

LEE: Just as a reminder to -- why I'm so optimistic that you'll be done before the Home Occupations Ordinance is that you have the hearing on Monday and Thursday, the following Thursday and then a Monday again, that takes you out to the 17th. So you got four more hearings, you know, that are on your docket to try and work through some of these before we get to the home occupation, so there's still -- I'm still hopeful we'll get there.

WRISTON: We got the site-specific requests though.

LEE: Site-specific requests we know we're going to have to do a separate hearing notice. It will take us at least three weeks to do that, so, you know, we're probably beyond the home occ stage.

MOSS: There's hope I won't be here on Monday, that should speed things up considerably.

RUPLEY: So we'll be done.

BARCA: Who else is missing on Monday?

LEIN: Haven't heard from Jeff. Jeff still hasn't responded to my E-mail so.

WRISTON: I don't know either.

LEIN: Okay. But, Ron, you are available Monday and originally you indicated you weren't going to be?

BARCA: That was the case, yeah.

LEIN: Okay. So there will be five of us here so.

BARCA: We'll still have a quorum.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The hearing adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning. The minutes can also be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at [www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP\\_PCagenda.asp](http://www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP_PCagenda.asp)

*Minutes Transcribed By:*  
*Cindy Holley, Court Reporter*  
*Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant*

SW\min 10-30-03

LEIN: Okay. With that, meeting's adjourned. Thank you very much.